

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1892.

ANGLO-SAXON Scâr-heard.

THE compound *scâr-heard* and the phrase *scârum heard* seem to be stumbling-blocks to all editors, translators and lexicographers. The true meaning would be more easily determined, of course, if examples were of more frequent occurrence. *Scâr-heard* (according to Grein) occurs but twice and *scârum heard* but once. The passages are as follows (Grein's text):

*Sceolde sweordes ecg
scearp and scâr-heard of sceðan folme
fýr-mælum fâh seorh âcsigan.*

Andreas, 1135.

*ymb þes helmes hrôf hêafod-beorge
wirum bewunden wala stan hêold
þat him fêla lâfe frêcne ne meahton
scâr-heard sceðan.*

Beowulf, 1033.

*Genam þâ wundenlocc,
Scyppendes mægð, scearpne mæce
scârum heardne, and of scâðe abræd.*

Judith, 79.

For *scâr-heard* these interpretations and conjectures have been offered:

1. "Schauer-hart"—Grein: 'Dichtungen.'
 2. "Ictu durus"—Grein: 'Sprachschatz.'
 3. "Fight-hardened?" [4.] (file-hardened?)"—Glossary to Harrison and Sharp's Beowulf.
 5. "By file hardened"—Garnett's translation of Beowulf.
 6. "Hard or [7.] hardened in the storm of battle or strife, [8.] hardened by blows—Baskerville and Harrison's Groschopp's Grein.
 9. "Hart für die Feile, [10.] gehärtet, tüchtig gemacht durch die Feile? [11.] hart im Kampf-schauer, im Streite?"—Körner's 'Einleitung': Glossary.
- For *scâr* in the passage quoted from "Judith," these have been offered:
12. "Ictus?"—Grein: 'Sprachschatz.'
 13. "Schauer [-hart]"—Grein: 'Dichtungen.'
 14. "Sehr (durch Schauern?) gehärtet—Körner's 'Einleitung': transl. of Judith.

15. "Das Schauern oder Scheuern?"—Körner's 'Einleitung': Glossary.

16. "Scouring?"—Glossaries to Sweet's Reader and to Cook's Judith.

17. "Sharp from scouring"—Cook's Judith: Transl. Besides these, Körner has quite a long note ('Einleitung,' Theil II, s. 238), which he concludes with these words:

"Dass übrigens *scâr* auch Kampf heissen kann, geht schon aus dem von Müllenhoff gesagten, ferner aus mhd. *beschâren*=mit Kampf befallen, und aus anderem hervor; diese Bedeutung wäre ebenfalls hier passend."

To the list of conjectures, I venture to offer another; first, however, stating two principles which will, probably, meet with general acceptance:

- I. Each element of a compound, or of a phrase, is entitled to due consideration in determining the force of the whole;
- II. The meaning determined must be in accordance with fact.

Of the interpretations collected above, unless *scâr* be understood to refer to the "scouring" or abrading of the file, Nos. 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 violate Principle i; and with this understanding of *scâr*, Principle ii is violated, for the action of the file cannot harden the object filed. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful whether *scâr* and *scour* have anything in common.

Nos. 3 and 7 violate Principle ii, for a weapon is not "hardened" by the storm of battle.

To No. 17 the additional objection may be offered that *heard* can hardly=sharp.

Nos. 6 and 11 are identical, and, taking *heard=terrible, dreadful*, are the most reasonable yet found.

Nos. 2, 8 and 12 (=hardened by a shower of blows from the blacksmith's hammer) are possibilities.

Before accepting either of these, however, let us consider some facts:

1. It was a distinct habit of O. E. poets to speak of the sword in terms relating to its manufacture. It is unnecessary to cite examples to support this statement. *Scâr-heard* (*scârum heard*) might easily, then, refer to the preparation of the sword for effective use.

2. Swords are now, and, perhaps, always have been hardened by being heated red-hot and dipped into cold water.

3. To suppose that *scûr-heard* meant *hardened in water* would be especially appropriate for the sword, since this weapon is almost entirely of steel. *Scûr-heard* is applied only to the sword, and not to any other weapon, offensive or defensive.

4. To suppose that *scûr*=(1) *shower of water*, then (2) *water at rest*, as the concrete result of the shower, might seem strained, especially as there can be adduced no examples of its use in the latter sense; but it would give us a very intelligible meaning for the passages, and does no more violence, perhaps, to the meaning of *scûr* than many, if not all, of the renderings quoted. Moreover, is such supposition too violent for O. E. poetry?

5. If such be the meaning, it may be asked why the poet did not form some compound more easily understood—such as *regn-heard*.* The answer is: (1) He could hardly have formed one that would express so vivid a poetic idea, and (2) the alliteration would be spoiled, for it will be observed that *scûr* forms part of the alliteration in each of the three passages quoted.

6. To all this it may be added that the "village blacksmith" always, even now, prefers to have pure rain-water in his "slack-tub."

7. If this explanation of *scûr-heard* be accepted, it will explain the equally troublesome *fîr-heard* in Beowulf, 305:

fâh and fîr-heard ferh wearde hêold.

It will be observed, too, that *fîr* forms a part of the alliteration, and is, to that extent, necessary.

It is no part of the writer's wish to force this explanation upon unwilling scholars:^x it is rather suggested to them, and their good judgment will approve it or condemn, as it deserves. We may dismiss the subject with Körner's words:

"Mangel an lexicographischen Hilfsmitteln hindert mich auch hier . . . mir ein selbständiges, sicheres Urtheil zu bilden."

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

^x. The explanation given by Leo ('Angelsächsisches Glossar,' 640, 30), and Bosworth-Toller, both of which I have seen since the above was written, do not in any wise affect the point in question.

ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION.

THE "GUIDE TO PRONUNCIATION" AGAIN.

THE review in the April NOTES of my criticisms on the "Guide to Pronunciation" at least assures me that some notice is being taken of my article, and this means I hope some thoughtful consideration of the questions at issue. Were I sure this consideration would include a second reading of my criticism beside the review, I should be quite willing to let the matter rest. Certainly I do not care to make a rejoinder merely in the interests of discussion, and I shall try to say nothing which will be discussion for its own sake.

A large part of my article has been wholly untouched by the reviewer. He has merely misstated my position with the remark that it "needs only to be stated to be at once rejected." But I did not propose "going back to the early sources of the language, and tracing the sounds along the line of historical development." I did propose taking some advantage of the facts already known in the history of English sounds, in order to understand and account for their present relationships, and until this is done I believe there will be no sound basis for orthoëpy. Ask yourself the question, on what does orthoëpy now rest, and try to answer it. Can any one assert that it has at present any firmer basis than the indefinite "they say," and the traditions of preceding orthoëpists. The latter sometimes take precedence, since for the distinction between *fern* and *urn* Prof. Porter frankly admits that, "the majority of orthoëpists are in favor of observing it. It is at the same time true that, by the majority of English-speaking people, it is not actually observed." Now what does orthoëpy, or right pronunciation, mean in this connection? Is one sound so much better than another *per se*, that a distinction must be set up as a standard for the next twenty-five years, which is known to be disregarded by the majority of speakers at present? That two sets of words appear with *e*, *i*, or *u* in an orthography which became fossilized several centuries ago, is scarcely reason for such a distinction.

On the other hand, the sound of a vowel depends, as a rule, upon the sound out of which it has developed, together with its phonetic environment. This requires that we

recognize these two factors, and a clear recognition of them makes it possible to state the law in its simplest and completest form. It was this that I tried to enforce in my previous article by citing copious examples, and this Prof. Porter has tried to brush away by his misstatement of my position.

Some other points of my article are, however, taken up in detail, and these I wish to notice as briefly and as fairly as possible.

The reviewer first denies my statement in regard to the differences between the Bell system and the modifications by Sweet on the one hand, and his own modifications of Bell on the other. It was not a radical statement to begin with, but I gave examples to show the differences to which I called attention. Whether these are "general features" the reader may determine. It may be said, however, that the most admirable general feature of the Bell system, as of the modified Sweet system, are simplicity and ease of reference, from both of which there seem to me considerable deviations without improvement.

The reviewer also makes much of my charge that there is confusion between scientific and popular nomenclature. I am glad he did, for it seems to me his lengthy explanation fairly substantiates the charge. As Prof. Porter still clings to the old nomenclature in regard to long and short vowels, and has added both the newer phonetic names and a distinction of "naturally" long and short, it seems to me the charge is not unfounded. Again I say, I do not see any reason for the distinction "naturally long and naturally short." The reviewer says:

"Most phonetists will agree that, in the English language, certain of the vowels have a quality that fits them for long quantity, so that they can readily and easily be prolonged in actual utterance; while others, of an opposite quality, are in a similar manner fitted for short quantity, so that they can be prolonged only by a forced and, in some sense, unnatural effort."

Now what is the meaning of this? Does Prof. Porter assert that the sounds commonly represented by *ə*, *ɛ*, *ɪ*, for instance, can not be prolonged? The first is so prolonged, or lengthened with the same quality, by many persons in this country. The vowels *ə* and *ɪ*,

it is true, have remained short under certain conditions from very early times, but this is probably because we have no long vowels of exactly the same quality, with which these could range themselves when lengthened. In Middle English there was an open long *ɛ*, with which open short *e*, when lengthened, associated itself in many cases. Moreover, this long open *ɛ* is sometimes heard dialectally at the present time. There is certainly nothing "unnatural" about this, and for my part I do not see that the distinction is a wise or necessary one. As to deciding about the length of *a* in *ask* by comparison with a French *a*, as I understand Prof. Porter does, this seems to me to be making little of observation and much of theory.

In respect to the use of "regular long" and "regular short," there is no necessity for mixing them up with two other varieties of long and short, even if, for the popular mind, it is best to continue these long-used terms. This is what I objected to, and I must insist upon it even at the peril of being accused of "mental confusion." In connection with this subject, Prof. Porter has again illustrated my criticism on his choice of examples. He cites "rēlate" and rēlative," "rēcord" and rēcord" along with "impēde and impēdiment," as examples of the "regular long changed to the regular short." Now of course there is no case of change here, in the phonetic sense, since the vowels have been different from the time these words entered the language and assumed the accent they now have. But besides this, neither *relate'* nor *record'* have a long vowel in the first syllable, for the simple reason that all vowels in unaccented syllables are short in English.

Prof. Porter objects to what I said in regard to an open syllable. I think if the whole of what I wrote is taken together it will not be found so far wrong. But let me add this. The distinction of open and closed syllables is of little value, except as it has a direct bearing on the quality of vowel sounds. Now, both at the present time, and in the previous development of English, accented vowels followed by a single medial consonant, show the same development in most cases as those in strictly open syllables; that is they differ in their de-

velopment from vowels followed by a final consonant or by two consonants. Examples are numerous in the whole history of English sounds, as well as in present English. For instance, the vowel sound in such words as *care*, *ware*, *bare*, *hair*, *tear*, etc., is the same in each locality, though the vowel in the group of words may be different in different localities. But the vowel in *parent*, *parity*, *carry*, *Mary*, *wary*, etc., does not necessarily follow the sounds in the preceding words as proved by the great variety in these cases. The evident reason is that there is a difference in the relationships of these two sets of sounds, *care*, *ware*, etc., being strictly closed syllables, while the others are not examples of closed syllables in any such sense. For practical purposes they are open syllables, or may best be classed so, since the variety of sounds heard in the second set of words classes them with vowels in open syllables. I myself doubt if *parent* ever has the exact sound of *a* in *care*. As I hear it, it has no vanish and is usually shorter. The same is true of *gore*, *gory*, *tore*, *Tory*. At least the fact that Prof. Porter himself admits *parent* is exceptional,—a fact which I did not fail to recognize before writing my criticism—shows that he should not have admitted it to his list of examples. Examples should be typical, not exceptional cases.

As to short *o* in English I gave my own observation, somewhat extensive both east and west, and I cited two authorities whose independent investigation seemed to agree with mine. Prof. Porter tries to overthrow these by the general statement that "competent observers may be found in abundance to bear emphatic testimony against the opinion so rashly expressed." Will the reviewer cite a few "competent observers" and give some record of their observations? If the opinion I offered is untenable, I shall be quite willing to acknowledge the error when the proof is forthcoming. But the people cited as "competent" ought to be those who have made some consistant endeavor to find out the facts. I very much fear that most people in this country have worshipped "Webster" so long, that they are certain they speak exactly as he says they should, without observation of any kind.

As to the people I meet, I may say in answer to Prof. Porter's question, that they are from all parts of the country, but more largely from New England and the central and western states. So far as I have been able to know the facts there is no reason to suspect foreign influence, and, besides, I know of no foreign influence that would not produce just the opposite effect. Of my own familiar acquaintance, I know of but two who use English short *o*. One is a Canadian of Scotch descent, and one an American, who has lived in Canada and Germany for a considerable number of years.

Prof. Porter has wholly missed the point in regard to *Mahomet* and *Mohammed*. *Mahomet* was borrowed very early from the French, and its *o* at that time must have been unaccented. It, therefore, could not possibly have been English short *o* until it received the accent, which even at the present is not stable on the second syllable. The word *Mohammed* is, for etymological purposes, a totally different word, being borrowed very late, in this century perhaps, from some oriental speech. For these reasons the *o* and *a* of these words have not the remotest connection with the "bad" habit of Americans in pronouncing English short *o* as *a*.

In one respect, as Prof. Porter points out, I have misrepresented him, and I am glad to acknowledge it. The vowels in *fern* and *urn* are not separated in the 'International' as narrow and wide. What I was trying to enforce is, however, true; the words are put in different categories, and a different pronunciation is marked throughout the dictionary. As I have already pointed out, this is done in spite of the admission, that this distinction is not recognized by the majority of English-speaking people. In regard to citing the 'New English Dictionary' for support of the distinction, if Prof. Porter will read §4 of his "Guide" he will find it distinctly stated that the 'International' follows an American-English standard. This of course precludes any use of British-English as authority.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

**NOTES ON SOME WORDS USED IN
THE SUGAR INDUSTRY,
NOT IN THE CENTURY DICTIONARY.**

Entrain, entrainement—evidently from Fr. *entrainer*. The action of carrying over particles of syrup or sugar by the steam exhausted from vacuum-pans in boiling sugar. (*Louisiana Sugar Planter*).

First sugar, or simply *first* or *firs*ts.—In the manufacture of centrifugal sugars (see Cent. Dict. 'subcentrifugal,' and 'sugar') that made from the virgin syrup and boiled to grain (q. v.) in the strike pan is called first sugar, first or firs.—The molasses which runs out from the centrifugals in drying this, is boiled over and produces second sugars or seconds, the process being sometimes repeated to produce third or even fourth sugars.

Grain, to boil to—, to boil the syrup in the vacuum or strike pan until large crystals (grains) are forming, when the *masse cuite* (q.v.) or *melada* (see Cent. Dict.) is either emptied directly into the mixer and thence run through the centrifugals, or carried into the hot room to further the crystallization of the sugar.

Juice—Not in Cent. Dict. in the technical acceptance of liquor extracted from the sugar cane before it reaches a certain degree of density by evaporation, and goes into the vacuum pan, where it becomes technically known as syrup.

Masse cuite, or sometimes *cuite* only—a synonym of *melada* (see Cent. Dict.) and much more frequently used in this country. The heavy crystallizing syrup as it comes from the strike pan, before it is drained of its molasses in the centrifugals.

Open Kettle—open pan in which the syrup is reduced until it begins to crystallize. This was the process universally employed in making sugar before the introduction of the vacuum pan and centrifugal machine; it is still in general use among the smaller sugar planters.—Also a trade name for sugar manufactured by this process and synonym of muscovado, in contradistinction to centrifugal sugar, for which see Cent. Dictionary.

Seed cane—the seed or plant cane (the latter alone is in Cent. Dict.) of the first year's growth.—Also the cane reserved for planting. (See *Stubble* below.)

String proof, to boil to—, to boil the syrup in the vacuum or strike pan until it becomes so viscous that it will be ropy or stringy, when tested between the fingers. The mass thus reduced is emptied into wagons and run into a hot room, where it is allowed to crystallize slowly; this process is generally followed for all sugars except first sugars (q. v.), and they are often called *wagon sugar*.

Syrup—see above under *juice*. The molasses which runs out when drying the *masse cuite* (q. v.) in the centrifugals is never known technically by sugar boilers as syrup. The technical acceptation of the word used singly, is limited to the condensed juice (q. v.) from the time it enters the vacuum pan—(single, double and triple effect) until it is turned out as *masse cuite* (q. v.) in the centrifugal (see Cent. Dict.) process, or to the condensed juice of the cane just before it crystallizes in the open kettle process, (see Cent. Dict., 'syrup,') this is what is known as *syrop de batterie* among Louisiana sugar planters.

Stubble—technically, in sugar planting, the sugar cane in the field after the first year. The first year the seed cane is laid in the furrow and from each joint a number of canes spring up, these when ripe are cut down to the ground for the first year's crop; from the *stubble* or stool the second, third, etc., year's crops grow in succession.

Windrow, (v. b.)—In speaking of sugar cane, the operation of cutting two adjacent rows of cane and laying them in the intervening furrow, to protect the plant from the effects of frost which inverts the sucrose in the cane, and diminishes or destroys its value for sugar making.

H. TALICHET.

Austin, Texas.

O. E. ēa=GERMANIC ē, AND OLD ENGLISH SHORTENING BEFORE h+cons.

AN O.E. ēa for Gc. ē Sievers finds in *nēah* (§57, 2 d) and suggests that it may here appear instead of ē by analogy to forms like *nēan* *nēar*, in which ēa is due to contraction.*

*Davidson, *Publ. M.L.A.*, 1891, p. 128, explains the ēa of *nēah* as "breaking before h"; but breaking affects only short vowels.

Kluge implies another instance of Gc. *æ*=O.E. *ēa* in associating O.H.G. *smāhi* with O.E. *smēalič*,† but I do not know how he would explain the diphthong. It is, probably, this difficulty that has led some (Cosijn, Zupitza, etc.) to see in *smēalič* a Gc. *au*.

There is, however, really no difficulty, for *ēa* is just what we should, under the circumstances, expect in O.E. Gc. *æ* W.G. *ā* shortens in O.E. before *h+cons.* (S. § 125; Kluge, P's 'Gr.' 1. p. 868) and this short vowel is later broken to *ea* (S. § 82) and, after the falling away of *h* before the sonorous consonant (S. § 222,2), is regularly lengthened to *ēa*. The same applies to *smēamete*, *smēawyrhta*, etc., as well as to *nēalæcan -ung*, *nēaliče*, *nēawist*, etc.; so that the *ēa* of *nēah* is doubtless due to these compounds as well as to *nēan nēar*.

It is evident that difficulty would accompany the attempt to mark real, not 'historic,' quantities in O.E.; but is it not absurd to continue to mark vowels long before *h+cons.*, when we have, side by side with them, forms that could only arise as a result of shortening? I refer to the well-known case of *leoh_t < liht < liht* (S. § 84 N¹), to *wéofod < *weohbod < *wihbod < wih-beod* (Kluge, P. B. B., viii. 527), to *betwéonum < *betweohnum < *betwihnum < *betwihnum* (Goth. *tweihnaí*), as well as to *smēalič*, *nēawist*, etc., above. That this shortening is very old may be inferred from the fact that it preceded breaking, and (unless the forms *fa-, fælæcan*, *gema(h)lic*, etc., are due to the influence of their primitives, which is very possible) the shortening does not appear to have affected *ā*<the diphthong *ai*, at least not when it did other vowels, that is, before the time of breaking.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF BAYOU.

So far as I am able to ascertain, Webster's is the first dictionary to derive *bayou* from *boyau*, and this derivation has been seen so long in print, and has been repeated in so many

†The definitions of *smēalič*, etc., in 'B.T.' are biased by the theory that these words are related to *smēagan* and *smīgan*, and that the development was 'crawl,' 'penetrate,' 'profound,' 'skillful' and 'exquisite.'

followers of Webster, that it seems to have become accepted as an incontrovertible truth. Now, Mahn is notoriously unreliable in his etymologies, and it is hardly probable that he has been more accurate in this instance. The word is evidently a French dialectic form, and if *boyau* was transformed into *bayou*, it is, to say the least, very probable that this change took place in Louisiana, where the word was first used in this country, and where it is almost exclusively used now. But the *bayous* of Louisiana are common enough to have left traces in public documents or private deeds, and if the form *boyau* has ever been used to express the notion of *bayou*, then Mahn's etymology has almost been proven a lucky guess, for to complete the proof the phonetic changes that led from *boyau* to *bayou* would also have to be traced in order to give his etymology a scientific value.

If the form *boyau* is not found in such documents, and if the phonetic changes cannot be followed step by step, then I would suggest two theories as to the possible origin of the word:

1. It may be a French dialectic form and have been introduced into Louisiana from some French province, though I have never found it in any glossary. But as I do not find a parallel to the changes of *boi* into *ba*, nor of *au* into *ion*—for the French pronunciation in Louisiana is not *bi-ōō* (Webster) but *bā-ū* with a slight stress on the last syllable—it is probable, if it is of French origin, that it was formed from *baie*: as *voie* gave *vo-ion* *voyou*, so *baie* would naturally give *ba-ion*, *bayou*.

2. But if it is not a French dialectic form, then the Spanish *ba(h)ia* offers the most plausible etymology. It may readily have been changed in the mouths of Louisiana Frenchmen into *bā-ū*, *bayou*, which naturalized into English with a shift of the accent to the first syllable became Webster's *bi-ōō*.

As to the parallel meaning of *gut* in English, I have searched in vain in French dictionaries for *boyau* meaning a stream of water of any kind, or a *gut* as exemplified in English in the Gut of Canso. French is my mother tongue and I have lived in several parts of France, Northern, Central and Southern, yet I have never seen nor heard the word used in such

an acceptance, nor have I ever seen it in thirty odd years of reading of French works of all kinds, including dictionaries, vocabularies and glossaries, the latter of which I have consulted with this definite object in view.

Moreover, there is no difficulty about the meaning, according to either of my theories: under *baie*, Littré says: "Petit golfe dont l'entrée est resserré"; while Spanish *bahía* often means an arm of the sea.

H. TALICHET.

Austin, Texas.

**NOTE ON A PARIS MANUSCRIPT OF
GUERINO IL MESCHINO.**

THE Italian prose romance of 'Guerino' (or 'Gherino') 'il Meschino,' sometimes further surnamed 'di Duracio' or 'Durazzo' (in French 'Guérin-Mesquin') has been looked upon at various times as a possible source of the 'Divina Commedia' (cf. Ginguené, 'Histoire Littéraire d'Italie,' i, p. 488 and ii, p. 24ff.). Gaspary, however, together with most Italian writers, attributes the work to a certain Andrea dei Magnabotti da Barberino in Val d'Elsa, who lived about the beginning of the fifteenth century, and is the reputed author of a series of romances. If Andrea is the author of the work, and not merely a translator from the French, as has been supposed, it is, of course, impossible that the 'Guerino' should have been known to Dante.

The same romance exists at the 'Bibliothèque Nationale' of Paris in MS. Ital. 491, described by Marsand, 'I Manoscritti Italiani della Regia Biblioteca,' i, p. 108, under the title of 'Guerino il Meschino.' This MS. is marked on the back: "Hist. di Durasq."

Bibl. Nat. MS. Ital. 98 is also described by Marsand, i, p. 50, as a "Vita di San Patrizio"; this MS. is marked on the back: "legenda di S. Patruicio."

An examination of the script, kind and size of paper, etc., of these two pieces shows that they are parts of one and the same MS., the narrative of Il Meschino's visit to the Purgatory of St. Patrick in Ireland forming the sixth book of the romance. The last page of MS. Ital. 491 contains at the bottom the words: 'questo loco secundo la ligenda,' which are

the opening words of MS. Ital. 98: 'questo loco secundo la legenda di santo patricio fo in questo modo facto nel suo principio, etc.'

It is this reworking of the legend of the Purgatory of St. Patrick which Ginguené (*loc. cit.*) erroneously supposes to be the source of the 'Espurgatoire de Saint Patrice' of Marie de France.

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Johns Hopkins University.

**SOME DOCUMENTS IN THE LIFE OF
CHRISTOVAL SUAREZ DE
FIGUEROA.**

ALL that we know of the life of Figueroa he tells us in his 'Passagero' (Madrid, 1617), a work of considerable interest, especially for its remarks upon the Spanish drama, and its criticisms of contemporary Spanish authors, of whom he does not always speak in the kindest terms.

Elsewhere,¹ I have attempted a sketch of his career based upon his 'Passagero,' and the following documents, if they add few facts to what is already known, at least seem to confirm the opinion of his character which I have there expressed. Figueroa was a member of that great army of office-seekers in Spain, which first came into prominence in the time of Charles V, and for which recruits have never been wanting up to the present day. He tells us in the most important of the papers here published, a letter written by his own hand in 1624, that he had served his king and country in different capacities for twenty-seven years. The offices he held, however, could not have been very lucrative, or perhaps he was, what was so rare in those days among Spaniards in public office, an honest man. At all events, he informs us in this 'tragic story' as he calls it, that he is without means, and complains bitterly of the ingratitude of his king. His letter, however, must have had the effect of re-instating him in office, for we find him holding the position of *Uditore della Rigia Udienza* in Catanzaro, Calabria, in 1627, where he fell into the hands of the Inquisition

¹ "The Spanish Pastoral Romances," *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association*, Vol. vii, No. 3.

and was thrown into prison. How long he remained in prison we do not know, but he must have emerged safe and sound, for in 1634 | he held office in Trani, a town on the Adriatic, in the province of Bari.

I.

CHRISTOVAL SUAREZ DE FIGUEROA.

(MS. I, 68. Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, pp. 369-371b).

La tibieza de mi esperitu ha cobrado algun aliento para escrivir este papel con la merced que entendi me haze V. S. a quien supp[lic]o perdone su forçosa prolixidad; pues tiene por costumbre no negar iguales fauores a los profesores de letras. Hallandome en Madrid sin necessidad, y en mi corta esfera quieto, se publico la acertada eleccion del Sr Duque de Alua para este Virreyano. La vecindad de casas, y sobre todo el deseo que siempre tuue seruirle, perturbo en parte aquel sosiego, ya en mi como natural, para salir de la corte y seguirle. Comuniquelo con Bernardino Diaz, su secretario; y auiendo interuenido antes cierta ocasion, que el mismo me confessó, auia sido grata al Duque, con su bêneplacito vine a este Reyno. En el dentro de pocos dias me ocupó en plaça de Auditor de Leche y dentro tambien de pocos dio la misma a Geronimo Alzamoro. Esta improuisa qvanto immatura prouision, juzgaron no pocos deuia nazer de otra para mi de mayor aumento; mas llegó presto el desengaño, reconociendose era priuacion. Participó assi mismo deste golpe Snº Antonio Ricciardo, tambien auditor allí, cuyo puesto, antes de cumplir en el, ocupó Franco Capo Blanco. Estos fueron los rayos: mas aora es fuerça referir a V. S. con toda verdad, algo de mis acciones, para que segun ellas haga despues juicio su integridad y rectitud. Aquel tribunal se hallaua entonces sin cabeza, por estar el Presidente auia seis meses en la cama. En la ciudad y provincia gran licencia de cometer atroces crimenes vexada una y otra de varios delinquentes, jamas perseguidos, y en fin sumamente eclipsado el decoro de la justicia. Tratose, y lo solicite yo en partic[ul]ar que todo cobrasse mejor forma: y porque juzgué conueniente sumo rigor, donde la insolencia era suma, procuré derribar primero las basas que sostienian y amparauan los facinerosos. Embestilos animosamente y sin respeto a grados y riquezas los forcé a mudar vida, por lo menos aparente. Aquel pueblo por naturaleza es mas que otros pernicioso y libre; y sobre todos los nobles, cuyas casas eran inuiolables sagrados de homicidas y otros malhechores. Estos estrañaron tan insolita nouedad; porque llegada la ocasion de exceso, solo el bueno era reseruado de molestia y castigo. Hazia reconocer por instantes a los clérigos reboltoños y de mala opinion, y quitarles las armas, de que abundauan siempre, remitiendoselos despues a sus prelados. En seis meses, en dos cadenas se embiaron cien ombres a galera; se ahorcaron cinco, y condenaron fol. 1b. a muerte otros; siendo assi que auia mas de quatro años que allí no se auia executado este genero de justicia. De todo fui dando parte al Duque, segun los casos se yuan ofreciendo, que por cartas despachadas por escritorio, mostro hallarse satisfecho dello; y ser conueniente se procediese en tal forma. Ni olvidé como experto en los frutos de los oficios, tuviere S. E. por bien estar aduertido de los odios que ocasionauan estos rigores, para no dar facil credito a qualquier siniestra relacion que se hiciesse contra los introductores; mas esta preuencion fue de ningun prouecho. Sabida pues la nueua del sucesor, escriui al Virrey fuese seruido mirar por mi reputacion, mandando se me diesse alguna noticia de las culpas, (si es que las suponian) para poder satisfacer con descargos; o que por comentos (miserable partido y consuelo en tan grande calamidad) se me embiasse licencia para hazer dexacion del oficio; antes que el nueuo proueido llegasse: y esto todo representé con razones de tanta fuerza, y palabras y sumisiones tan dignas de piedad y commiseracion, que mouieran los bronces, y enternicieran las piedras. Alzamoro por los calores detuuo la partida un mes, y assi juzgado a proposito mi venida, por ver si con la presencia reuocaua, o detenia semejante deliberacion, tomé el camino de Napoles con euidente riesgo de la vida, respeto

fol. 2a.

de las mutaciones. ²En Bitonto encontré al sucesor con que perdi del todo la esperanza de lo imaginado; prosiguiendo mi viage con el desconsuelo que dexo considerar a V.S. Llegado a esta ciudad, hable a Bernardino, y hallele tan diferente de como le auia dexado, que no se me pudiera mostrar mas aduerso, si entre los dos se professara apretadissima enemistad. Por ningun camino pude descubrir las armas de la ofensa: porque al preguntarselo, se encogia y callaua: solo con palabras nada ambiguas me significó, carecia el caso de remedio por la indignacion con que se hallava el Duque y que solo podia ser de prouecho en desengafiarme; que dispusiese de mi persona como mejor me estuviessen cerrada segun lo referido esta puerta; cerré yo todas las que el discurso me abria para manifestar mi inocencia; porque de que me hauian de seruir, sino faltava el oydo del superior, por cuyo medio podia pretender ser restituido y reintegrado? Desauciado por este camino, me rendí del todo a la desesperacion y solo traté de yrme a España en la primera embarcacion. En este inter, mi colega Juan Antonio, no como yo solo y desalido, ha por su parte rebuelto (como se suele decir) toda piedra para ser desagrauiado. Hablaron sobre su justicia al Virrey varias veces diuersos auogados; y segun entendi, tambien en su fauor el Regte Fuluio de Constanto; y el Proregte Diego Lopez. Y aunque en algunos meses nada se apruechassen tan solicitas diligencias; al cabo recorriendo de colateral (con ocasion de cierto proceso, que por despacho de escritorio se formó contra el en aquellas partes) declaró como diestrissimo en reconocer calumnias y falsedades, no auerse prouado nada contra el tal Ricciardo: y que assi deuia S. E. restituirle al mismo puesto, o a otro mejor. Este decreto salio haura dos meses, y en ellos el interesado habló muchas veces al Virrey, pidiendo su ejecucion que entreteniendo con blandos respuestas no ha tomado en el negocio resolucion hasta ora. Mientras aqui han passado estos incidentes, lo que acerca de la persecucion he podido rastrear fue; auer procedido del Presidente del Fiscal y Gouernador de la Ciudad en esta forma. Mejorado Anibal macedonio de aquella larga enfermedad, me referen tuuo a sumo disgusto sin surpassé nadie el renombre de rigido en administrar justicia, y en infundir temor y obediencia en los subditos por tocarle solo a el este peso como a cabeca, o como a Maestre de Campo, siendo propio suyo el tener enfrenada aquella ciudad y la prouincia toda. Y pareciendole, no se podia diminuir la loa de la presente mutacion, sino con vituperio y discreditio de quien la causaua, siendo sugeto obstinado, y no menos vano que sagaz, se unio con el Fiscal y Gouernador comenzando a fulminar relaciones y malos officios al Duque contra nosotros. No se si V. S. tiene algun conocimiento del proceder del Fiscal. Fue desnudo y pobrissimo a aquella Aud^a nueve años haura, y oy se halla con treynta mil ducados. Professa ser dueño absoluto del Tribunal y mas dueño de la Prouincia.

fol. 3a. Hombre soberuo y altiouo, con aparente compostura de inaudita simulacion. Donde acometiendo puede vencer se declara publico, y quando no, encubre con falsa risa el veneno del coraçon, obrando quanto mal puede de secreto. Es natural de Napoles, con hermanos y parientes de grandes inteligencias, y no menores brazos. El Gouernador es un mozo inexperto, y aunque por naturaleza no asperso de condicion, dexas[t]e ganar facilmente, juzgando como codicioso solo conueniencia lo que resulta en su interes. A este casado con hija de cierto Valeriola agente en España del Duque, tomaron por instrumento para hazer que yo perdiesse la amistad de Bernardino. Porque auindome dado un dia una carta del mismo venida en su pliego, me preguntó si era el secretario mi amigo: a que respondi le era gran Seruidor y que no desconfiaua miraria en las ocasiones con buenos ojos lo que le suplicassem. Con esto fundamento no mas, escriuen al Duque nos auiamos unido en el Tribunal Riccardo (sic) y yo, y que solo se hazia en el lo que los dos queriamos. Que de mi parte publicaua tener grande lugar en el palacio en virtud de Bernardino y que assi me seria facil conseguir por su medio lo mas dificultoso. Que con esta confiança procedia sin riendo y con escandalo: y era suma, auiendo sido el Fiscal el mouedor desta maquina, es de creer estam-

² Bitonto, a city and bishop's see, in the province of Bari, in southern Italy.

paria las razones y congruencias como se las dictaua al notable aborrecimiento que nos temia aplicandonos las peores colores que el supiese; solo por verse excluido del absoluto imperio que antes tenia; porque a la verdad se procuraua hiziesse cada uno no mas que su oficio. Esta carta ordenaron diesse al Duque cierto frayle, con la cortapisa de que importaua mucho passase V. E. los ojos por ella, sin que la viesse Bernardino: rezelando la podria ocultar si llegasse primero a sus manos. Leyda por el Virrey se la entregó al punto al mismo; que confuso y admirado se imagina respondio: No auia el dado jamas motiuo para nada de aquello, ni para que yo en aquellas partes vendiesse su nombre y fauores. Y dezia bien, porque en seis meses solo auia reciuido del la referida carta sin que esta tratase de mas negocios que corteses complimientos. Desde entonces comenzó la borrasca desecha. Bernardino se abstuuuo de reciuir carta mia, y dar al Duque las que en razon de avisos le embiaua, temeroso de lo passado. Constole a S. E. la discordia entre el Preside y nosotros, y enfin, dando por ventura credito a lo de la union; si ya no a cosas de peor sonido, ordinó con toda presteza las sabidas prouisiones. Y es de creer las justificaria de suerte, como tan benigno y recto, que en la pte que dexó de usar mayor seueridad, manifestó mayor clemencia; contentandose, puede ser, con quitarnos de allí por bien de paz, respeto de que llegando a mayor colmo los rancores, no sucediesen mayores escandalos. No admite o no haze posible su virtud la maldad agena; y por el consigte dificulta, o no figura verisimiles los debates y pasiones que interuenen entre los de quien se componen estos tribunales, llenos todos, por la mayor parte, de malquerencias y embidias, por las competencias y ambiciones, quando no, por sus propios intereses. Y por este camino puede ser facilmente engañado, y mas de gente que desde que naze exercé industrias y estratagemas para cuyo conocimto conuiene (como V. S. mejor sabe) tener muy despabilados los ojos; derribandose tal vez desde el trono de la bondad al centro de la malicia.

fol. 4a.

En esta forma, señor, nos assassinaron nuestros enemigos, valiéndose de importunas y falsedades. Porque quanto a la misteriosa conformidad que alegaron teniamos los dos, es notorio engaño y mentira: ya que en quantas causas se trajeron en el Tribunal, siempre concurrimos en los votos los tres Auditores, como se pudiera ver con facilidad. Y en la sospecha de sobornos (si es que tambien se valieron desta calumnia nuestros adversarios)

fol. 4b.

aunque las intenciones no fueran tan limpias en tan breve tiempo como fue el de tres meses y medio (auiendo sido hasta seis, ferias lo demas) no se ofrecieron ocasiones en que dejar de serlo: pues como puede constar de los procesos criminales despachados, casi todos fueron con sentencias de muerte o galera: y de los ciuiles apenas huuo uno en estado de poderlo determinar definitiuamente. Mas de que sirve la proposicion deste abono general, si jamas se ha venido a la averiguacion de particulares, siendo las supuestas culpas solo de bulto? Lo cierto es, merezco yo por ser muy malo, mas estrecha tribulacion: y por lo menos quedo en no poco deudor a los autores, por auerme hecho experto en arte, en que confieso era ignorantissimo. Con justa causa quedaron vanagloriosos y contentissimos, ya que cosa mas bien guiada para conseguir su intento no la he visto jamas. Con tan fuertes lazos en la aprehension de su Ex^a que es lo menos auerme dexado indefenso, cerrandome yo propio los labios; pues hasta la imaginacion ha carecido, mostrandose esterilissima de razones. Muerte, estupro, herida, ni coecho seguro estoy de auerlo cometido: en obras menudencias no me juzgo tan bueno; mas para las tales se introduxeron los sindicados al fin de las administraciones. Si primero huuiera auido carta de aduertencia o reprehension; o alcancaramos en que parte se hazia la punteria para herirnos, era forçoso acudir al reparo con disculpas o verdaderas satisfacciones; mas contra flecha tan veloz y al improviso tan peñetrante, que remedio sino el de Dios? Yo vine a este reyno confiado en la proteccion y aumento que mi persona podia esperar en el Duque, y asi en faltandome su graciā, espiró todo. Recorrer a colateral seria especie de quexa y esta ha de estar en todo tiempo lexos de mi. Ni se con que ocasion: porque quanto a ser restituido o mejorado, solo podra hacerlo quien sabe que estoy aqui expuesto y pronto a toda satisfacion, pero de que delito he de pedir gracia? Ni

fol. 5a.

de que culpa perdon? Solo podra distinguir y vencer esta confusion quien tiene aluedrio absoluto: y la mano que fue poderosa para desencasar esta piedra de golpe, es sola quien de golpe la puede boluer a su lugar, o aplicarla a mejor edificio. Aunque ya se terminaron para mi las pretensiones de por aca; pues aun quando por inopinado acaecimiento, se rompieron los densos nublados de enojos, y esta Alua excellentisima, por su grandeza, se mostrara en mi fauor con mas luz que el sol mismo, tras tanto seruir a satisfacion, era poca cosa una Auda; mayor jaula ha menester el paxaro. Ni deixare de apuntar, ser por extremo con ueniente passar los que escriuimos por iguales infortunios; pues con ellos dexan las plumas de ser bocales, boluiendose mas preuenidas y mañosas para tratar de todo, instruidas en astacias y engaños. Los jurisconsultos acaso pudieron imaginar o prevenir este modo de oprimir y descomponer? Y esta forma de petulante y arrebatado juicio? No por cierto, que no ay teorica de ten infame practica. La experiencia sola es quien la enseña: mas de victoria conseguida con tan afrentosa traycion indigna es la gloria. Y es justissimo que quien ligeramente dexó las comodidades y credito que tenia en la corte, buelua a ella con breuedad, mendigo y desacreditado; con trauajo en vez de aliuio, con castigo en vez de premio. Y sea, si alla buscado, aca huido: si alla juzgado benemerito y capaz; aca incapaz y demerito. Veynte y siete años ha que siruo al rey en diferentes cargos con certificaciones de Virreyes de mi buen proceder; con cartas de su Magestad en que lo confiesa y se da por bien seruido prometiendome en ellas aumentos y honras; solo aqui ve degenerado, perdiendo en un punto lo adquerido en tanto tiempo: suma desgracia. A. V. S. beso mil veces las manos por la merced que me haze en compadecerse della y crea que como en extremo agradecido, le sere verdadero y cierto seruidor en qualquiera parte que assista; celebrando (pues solo por este camino lo puedo retribuir) su acrisolado valor, sus muchas letras, su inaudita integridad y rectitud, columnas sobre que levanta monumento a la inmortalidad de su nombre. En lo demas, aunque me halle, quanto puede ser necessitado, sin amparo y socorro y en tierra donde todos lloran desdichas y miserias, le suplico no le ponga en algun cuidado mi remedio, pues sabe nos persuade la filosofia esfuerzo y constancia en la aduersidad y es justo rezelar no sea esta censura de participantes, y por esto conueniente procurar huir de incurrir en ella. En tanto dignese conceder perdon al prolixo tenor de mi tragica historia, escrito a V. S. para que le sepá, y le sea notoria la raiz de mi pretenso agrauio y el origen de mi crecido sentimiento. No se con que semblante ponerme ya en su presencia, pues de corto he faltado (con nota grande) a mi obligacion, en no auerme entrado por sus puertas a ofrecermele criado mas confio excusara V. S. este natural encogimiento permitiendo la enmienda. Gu^e nuestro Señor felicissimos años su persona como deseo.

fol. 5b. de Casa de Agosto 1624.

El Dr. Christoval Suarez de Figueroa.

Copia de la hortatoria fecha a Mons. Petromio obispo de Molfeta de que tanto se duele el Papa por este breve la qual le presento Juan Dominico de Jordano, actuario de la juridicione real.

II.

(Ms. E. 17, fol. 295 a, Bib. Nacional, Madrid).

Reuerende uirregie deuote dilecta A nostra noticia e peruenuto ch' d'ordine uostro con famiglia armata d'arme di fuoco prohibite per le regie pramaticæ de questo presente regno con habito de clerici sia stato carcerato D. Christophoro Figueroa dentro la chiesa di S. Luiggi sita al incontro del Real palazzo doue noi habitamo nel corpo di guardia doue di continuo accudono li trattenuuti soldati, et altri ministri militari in tempo che si celebrauano le sante messe, et diuini officj con molto scandalo del popolo et anco pericolo di quelli ch' andorno (sic) a far la detta cattura del che ne hauerebbe potuto resultare un gran tumulto in

disserruitio della diuina Maestra del Re nostro sigre, et di tutta questa citta, il che intendiamo habbiate fatto sotto colore d'essere ministro del santo officio, poi che si uoi lo füssino stato doueuati ricorrere a noi, e dimandare il regio l'xequatur, como si deue di ragione, e per antichissima consuetudine di questo regno, e lo fanno tutti li prelati del Regno alli quali come giudici ordinarij compete la giurisdittione nelle materie de sant officio, e come fa ancora il Nuntio di Sua Santita e si e falto in questo regno da quelli ch'hann hauuta commissione d'executar alcuni negotij della Sta inquisitione, ni esso accio che le cose che tocano alla religione cat^{ca} sianno executate con quel decoro, e sicura ch'si deue nelli regni de sua M^{ta} d achi e dalli suoi ministri uengono con particolare attentione fauorite et agituate come si e uisto sempre in tutte le occasioni che son occorse per difessa della santa fede Catt^{ca} e della fede Ap^{ca} Romana, e perche potrebbe succeder alcuno scandalo notabile si per voi si pasassi inanzi a dare simili ordini e conuien al seruicio di sua M^{ta} sapere con che titulo et in che forma uoi uo intrometeti in queste materie ci e parso farui la presente con la quale ne dicimo, et exhortamo che fra il termino di tre giorni debbiate exhibir auante di noi, l'ordini commissioni, o altra potesta in uirtu della quale uoi exercete giurisdictione in queste materie accio uiste si possa proueder da noi come conuiene in beneficio della Sta fede Catt^{ca} e della real jurisdictione che tiene sua M^{ta} in questo Regno, e che fra tanto non debbiate essercitare iurisdictione nessuna, ne tenere congregatione o tribunale ne familia armata ne far altro essercitio, accio non si turbi la quiete di questa citta e non si faccia pregiuditio alla giurisdictione di sua Maesta perche non facendosi da voi se pigliarando quelli remedij soliti e consueti pigliarsi ni casi simili senza expeditione d'altra hortatoria e non farti lo contrario per quanto desiderati far cosa grata alla p^{ta} Maesta et a noi la presente resti al presentante. Dat. Napoli die 28 mens Januarij 1630.

III.

Copia de breue del Papa Urbano viii para el Sr Duque de Alcala, Virrey de Napoles, sobre el negocio del Auditor Doctor D. Xpoual Suarez de figueroa.

(Ms. E. 17, fol. 294 b, Bib. Nacional, Madrid).

Dilecte fili: Nobilis uir, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Ea pietatis fama Regium Magistratum in Neapolitano regno suscepit nobilitas tua, ut speraret Italia coeteros Austriacæ potentiae ministros petere ist hinc posse propugnando Religionis exempla. Proinde nunquam timuimus fore, ut in urbe nobilissimi Regni Principe Regis uiribus per te laederetur ditio sacri huius tribunalis in quo cum fidei orthodoxæ unitas custodiatur, muniuntur coelestes aggeres publicæ tranquillitatis. Hinc conicere potes quo doloris vulnere transfixerit uiscera Pontifice charitatis, inopinatus ille nuntius qui nuper significauit Christophorum Figheroam, mandatu tuo eruptum violenter esse, e sacræ inquisitionis vinculis. Quod nam dilecte fili religiosæ Ciuitatis oculis spectaculum præbuisse putas, regios satellites gladiis minutabundos, dum sancti huius officii ministros, non solum palam perterrefacere, sed armis etiam spoliare ausi sunt, ut reus e legitimo carcere eductus in eius custodia detineretur, cui nullum ius in causis ad religionem spectantibus. Porro autem qui sapientia studiis ingenium excoluisti, scis quid tam graui in negotio, ecclesiastice ac Pontificiæ sanctiones decernant. Quæ enim ad religionis iura pertinent, ita nos tangunt, qui pro sacerdotis Maiestate vitam deuouere debemus, ut prætermittere non liceat quod ratio suadet, lex iubet et cœlum exigit ne patiare.

Nobilis uir tam foedam nomini tuo notam inuri, atque aduersus te excitari non modo numinis ultiōrem, sed etiam Regis iram constituentis gloriam potentiae, in defensione fidei et sacerdotii. Quare pro paternæ charitatis, et apostolicæ sollicitudinis officio monere voluimus, nobilitatem ut reum læsis sacræ inquisitionis ministris, ut suprema sacri huius tribunalis

ditio tam insigniter violata. Hoc a te solatium exigimus, atque etiam speramus, ut regiae pietatis imitatione eruditus, et nostris dictis excitatus gloriari possis plus Pontificia monita, quam pernitosia consilia ualuisse apud nobilitatem tuam, cui Nuntius Apostolicus mentem nostram declarabit et Nos paternam benedictionem impartimur. Datt. Romae apud Sanctam Mariam maiorem sub Annulo Piscatoris die ii fibruarii mdcxxx. anno Pontificatus Nostri septimo.

Joannes Ciampolus.

The answer of the Duke of Alcalá, as it recites no new facts, is not reproduced here.

IV.

CAUSAS DE INQUISICION.

(Ms. D. 154, Bib. Nacional, Madrid).

fol. 105. Contro

Christoforo figheroa Uditore allora della Regia Udienza in Catanzaro inquisito de auer estratto a uiua forza dalle Carceri di Nicotera francesco Anto Stantione Reo del Sto Ufizio.

Questo francesco Stantione fu carcerato diginbre 1627 perche essendo esattore del Monte della Pietà di Napoli eseguia contro i beni de chierici, fu quattro volte scomunicato et era indiziato di auer sparlato delle censure, dicendo que non le stimaua e che allora mangiaua con piu appetito, quando era scomunicato, che stava meglio scomunicato che prima, che non ostante le de scomuniche uoleua andare in chiesa e sentir messa, diceua che haueua dietro il vescouo e la sua mitra.

It recites that the said Stantione being imprisoned

'il figheroa andò con tamburo, e gente armata alle carceri con accette, archibugi e mazze ferra e perche russe quattro porte, e leuo di carcer detto Stantione,' etc.

Figueroa refused to come to Rome to answer for his offence and 'questo si nascose,' but finally on January 25. 1628

'fu veduto il figheroa nella chiesa di S. Luigi vicino al Palazzo del Vicere, e la mattina carcerato in detta chiesa, et arrestato nel conuento pro carcere. La notte seguente fu con uiolenta dalla soldadesca estratto, disarmati li custodi, e condotto en Castil Nuovo, e poco dopo eseguita l'oratoria contro di l' Ministro (sic) del Sto Ufizio.'

He remained seventeen days in the prison of Castel Nuovo, and was then conducted to the *Carceri della Nunziatura*. On fol. 107a. Figueroa in answer to the charges brought against him says: 'Jo in quel tempo ero uditore della Regia Udienza in Calabria.' His defense is very weak; he confesses the rescue

by force of arms, saying that the offense of which Stantione was accused was a very slight one and that 'non mi raccordo se il vescouo mi dicesse che era per causa di Sto Ufizio, potria essere che me l'hauesse detto, etc.'

Want of time made it impossible for me to read all the papers in the case. The following is extracted from the *Defesa del detto Christoforo figheroa*:

'Nel p^o. 2^o. & 3^o Articoli intende di prouare ch'egli e nato di padre e madre nobili di Vagliadolid, allenato cattolicamente, che sente messa, che ha seruito in diuersi carichi lo-deuolmente sua M^a anche con sodisfazione di Prelati ecclasticci' etc.

'Articoli 4^o & 5^o che per essere di Statione Spagnolo ha sempre tenuto in grand'ma riuerenza e timore il Tribunale del Sto Ufizio, essendosi in tutte le occasioni mostrato ubbidientissimo a seruire li ministri e tribunali soddetto, e che ha sempre abominato gli eretici e sospetti di eresia.'

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH ETYMOLOGIES.

Principles of English Etymology, by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, Litt.D. Second series. *The Foreign Element*. Clarendon Press, 1891. 8vo, pp. xxxi, 505.

IT is very desirable that one or more good books should be available on the subjects treated in this volume. I say subjects because the field covered is so wide, and so much special knowledge is needed for a treatment like that here attempted, that one man may well feel himself incompetent to treat adequately all the phenomena. And if the writer, as in the present case, can lay little claim to the knowledge of a specialist in any of the subjects treated, then his highest aim must be to put in a clear and attractive form the accepted results reached by those scholars who stand in the foremost rank as investigators of the matters concerned. It is true that Professor Skeat is not altogether an outsider for some of the languages here treated, for he has, as the author of an 'English Etymological Dictionary,' almost inevitably been led to study somewhat the Anglo-French and the continental dialects of Old French, so that we may expect him to know and use some of the best books and articles published. His great industry and careful reading of modern philological works are again shown in this volume, and he has himself apologized in his preface for undertaking a task for which he does not claim to be fully qualified.

Perhaps the most obvious criticism that can be made upon this volume is that it attempts too much, and goes into details which it would have been better to omit in the interest of the reader, who would thus get a better and clearer idea of the most important principles, and also in the interest of the author who would thus have avoided some mistakes, or at least doubtful statements, he has made. Further, the material drawn from the work of other scholars has not been fully digested in the author's mind before his own statements were allowed to get into print. This appears from various inconsistencies and unfortunate arrangements of his matter, as well as an occasional infelicity of statement. In what is the most important part of the whole book, the treatment of the Old French element in Eng-

lish, it is greatly to be regretted that Skeat did not consistently take as his starting point the Old French pronunciation as it existed in France, and make this the basis of his treatment of the secondary Anglo-French and of the further history of the Old French words in English. This part of the work would thereby have gained greatly in clearness and might have been, at the same time, given in less space, while the gain in space might have been utilized for the presentation of some of the real or apparent exceptions, if it seemed worth while to mention them at all. The jumble of the *o*-sounds (*ø* and *ø*; cf. §§66, 70, 77, 87) would then have been avoided. Professor Skeat is well known to understand fully the distinction between sounds and letters, as appears, for example, from his chapters on English spelling and on phonetic spelling in the First Series, of his, 'Principles of English Etymology,' and in the present volume he has given considerable space to the pronunciation of Anglo-French. He probably exaggerated the difficulty of starting from the sounds and considering the letters only as more or less good signs for the sounds, for it would seem that the idea must have occurred to him. It is true we do not know exactly what the phonetic distinction was between *g* (*ð*) and *g* (*ð*) in France, nor what the exact value of Old French *u*=Latin *ū* was, but we do know that these three different sounds existed, and developed differently, and their development in England has been in general subject to laws which can be clearly stated.

The author gives nearly two hundred and fifty pages (Chapters ii—xii) to French and its influence on English, as compared with less than two hundred to all other languages (including Latin, to words from which a chapter of somewhat over forty pages is given), while several pages are devoted to subjects not properly belonging in this book, or not specially appropriate in it. The preponderance given to French is of course fully justified. Pages 294–316 are given to Italian; 317–341, to Spanish; 342–349, to Portuguese; 350–371, to Greek; and 399–440 to all other languages (Slavonic, Persian, Sanskrit, Hindustani, Semitic, Finno-Tataric, various Asiatic languages, Polynesian, African, American). Chapter xviii (pp. 372–398) treats of prefixes and suffixes. Some

foreign elements in English, it must be remembered, were treated in the 'First Series,' as the words early taken from Latin, the foreign Teutonic words, and the Celtic words. The chapters devoted to French are: ii (pp. 3-22) the Introduction of French words; iii (pp. 23-43) Some Description of Anglo-French; iv (pp. 44-56) Specimens of Anglo-French; v (pp. 57-75) Effects of the English Accent; vi (pp. 76-125) Words of Anglo-French Origin: Examples; vii (pp. 126-136) On some changes in Pronunciation; viii (pp. 137-169) Words of Central French Origin; ix (pp. 170-181) Words of Late French Origin; x (pp. 182-204) French Words of Latin Origin.—The Vowels; xi (pp. 205-238) French Words of Latin Origin.—The Consonants; xii (pp. 239-248) French Words not of Latin Origin. These chapter-headings give some idea of the way in which the author has treated his subject, and I now proceed to some observations of detail, without discussing all the places I had marked, for this would carry me too far.

Page 11. "The old *w* . . . has disappeared in French, its place being supplied by *g*." Of course, *gu* (*g*) was Old French also, the *w* forms belonging to a different dialect. Also the *qu* in Old French was certainly not always pronounced as in Eng. *quit*.—P. 13. "Corpse (*ps* kept)." But the usual Old French form had no *p*, and the true English word representing Old French *cors* is *corse*, now poetical only, while the *p* in *corpse* is due to the etymological French spelling *corps*. The statement on p. 219 is better. To be sure the very oldest French does show *corps*. Why is the pronunciation of *ch* as *sh* in *chivalry* "detestable"? If usage sanctions it (cf. the 'New English Dict.' on *chevalier* and *chivalry*) it is correct, however much it may be opposed to an etymologist's views as to what is historically correct, and however irregular or historically wrong it may really be. It is our business, as linguistic students, to explain, if we can, the actual phenomena of language, but ought we to alter or try to alter the modern forms, even if we think we have a sufficient knowledge of the factors which have operated to produce them, simply because we think some of those factors ought not to have been allowed to exert any influence?—P. 21, §16. Can it

be that Skeat means that Chaucer considered Anglo-French to be as good as Parisian French? Does he think that anybody in England or anywhere else thought so in Chaucer's time? It is hardly necessary to say that the linguistic views here ascribed to Chaucer are more characteristic of the nineteenth century, in which, indeed, they are still far from being common to all persons of education, than of the fourteenth. Further, when on the next page we are told that the French of Paris had but lately risen into importance as a literary language the ordinary reader would hardly suspect that "but lately" is to be understood as meaning about two hundred years before. It might also be asked whether "the language of the English court under a king who claimed to be *also king of France*" was French of "the scole of Stratford atte Bowe."—P. 27. In connection with the statement here made about the work done for Anglo-French forms of English words thence derived, may be mentioned the notice of the 'Rough List' by Vising in the *Literaturblatt*, iv, 464.—P. 29. Laws of William I. The MS. is here ascribed to the thirteenth century, while on p. 44 it is said to be of the twelfth.—P. 30. To Behrens's earlier useful work may now be added his later treatment in Paul's 'Grundriss,' i, p. 799 ff., and Suchier's brief notice of this in the *Literaturblatt*, xii, 53. The table for Anglo-French pronunciation (pp. 37, 38) might be improved by omitting quantitative distinctions for the vowels, as so little is known of Old French and Anglo-French vowel quantities. For *e* and *o* the important thing to note is the difference in quality (*e*, *ɛ*, *ø*, *ø*). Similarly *ii* should be distinguished from *ui* (*u*), and this from *gi*, particularly where modern French is misleading, as for the word *oyster*, with which compare *usher*, *pew* (as pointing to *ü*). As to *ai* and *ei* the pronunciation was not always diphthongal; cf. the modern English and the varying early spellings, and the treatment of these diphthongs by Behrens. Anglo-Norman was by no means always spelt as it was pronounced, and for this problem we must keep in mind the older French pronunciation which was changing in not quite the same way in the dialects of France, while the influence of the French of France on that of England continued

more or less active, and Anglo-French was itself changing, and was exposed moreover to influences from English, and we must also remember that French words adopted into English were not all adopted or fully naturalized at the same time. Such considerations may help us to understand some of the exceptional or difficult cases mentioned by Behrens, for example, while we can see clearly the general correctness of the laws he gives. When the subject has been more studied we may see results not dissimilar to, but not agreeing entirely with those obtained by Förster for the dialect of Chrétien de Troyes. Skeat himself puts the matter better on p. 40. Is it well to speak of a diphthong *ea*? P. 41 puts it better. The form *œ* (pp. 38 and 42) should be put before *eo*, as being the original one, *eo* being a later variant in spelling after the sound became *e* (or, perhaps, while the sound was *ö*, if that was the intermediary stage). On p. 42 the sound of *eu* in Fr. *peuple* seems to be considered a diphthong ("and then [that is, after having taken the sound of French *eu*] it became a monophthong"). The pronunciation *œy* (*y=ü*) for *eu* it is indeed well to query; it would have been better to leave only the query (or to substitute *eu* for *œy*) and omit the references to Schwan, which can hardly do the reader any good. Several different things are here put together, with no proper regard to what the ground-forms for Anglo-French were in each case, and the cases of *eu* in Schwan's §285 are not mentioned at all. See also Neumann's review of Schwan in Gröber's *Zeitschrift*, xiv, and cf. Skeat's own § 83.

Page 40. "A[nglo] F[rench] *sch* was originally pronounced as written, that is as *s . . .* followed by *ch* (in *charge*), but passed into *sh* (in *shall*); hence the M. E. symbol *sch* for the sound of *sh*." But cf. Eng. *peach*=O. Fr. *pesche*, also *cheat*, *chess*, *checker*, *chine*, by the side of *marshal*, and observe the note on p. 71 of this book, where not quite the same thing is said as here on p. 40. I need not repeat what I have already said on the English sound *s* in words from the French (see Mod. LANG. NOTES, March, 1892, col. 154). The explanation for the M. E. spelling *au* before *n* + cons. suggested by Skeat (p. 41), that it was

caused by the originally nasal sound of the *a*, is far from being certain. Skeat himself says that vowel nasality was "probably soon lost in Anglo-French since English shows but slight traces of it" (What are the "slight traces" meant?) As Skeat says, generally speaking, the Old French nasal vowels do not seem to have left traces in English, and moreover this Anglo-French *au* for older *a* is late Anglo-French, not an early phenomenon. It is at least possible that it was due to some peculiar English influence, which caused the glide from *a* to the following *n* to take on a quality resembling or reaching *u*, and it is not impossible that this may have been caused by the peculiar resonance of the *n* in English pronunciation. The subsequent change of *au* to *a* would in that case be similar to the changes in the case of *chafe* (see Murray, s. v.), *save*, *sage* (the plant), *savage*. Moreover, in the word *jaundice* the *au* was certainly originally a diphthong in France and a true diphthong must once have existed in the case of such words as *laundry*, *laundress*, and probably of *saunter*. Yet these words have developed in Modern English in the same way as *haunt*, *daunt*, and *as*, in much at least of "standard English," *lance*, *dance*, *aunt*. The other result of the diphthong *au* is shown in the modern sound *ɔ* (as in *awe*), the common value assigned now to the spelling *au* or *aw*; as in *haughty*, *brown*. It is perhaps worth adding that *laundry* has in Maine, or had there some twenty or thirty years ago, very frequently the value *laundri* with the diphthong *au*, instead of *landri*, and I may remind readers of the Teutonic change of old Aryan vocalic *n* to *un*. Another case of the old diphthong *au* giving *ɔ* is *falcon*, in which, however, the intrusive *l* is now sounded by some. With this view it is comparatively easy to understand the various forms given by Skeat in the other places where he touches on this subject (cf. §§49, 50, 51, 54, 82); except indeed that I have not attempted to explain why *au* has sometimes developed like old *a* and sometimes gives *ɔ*. On this point I have as yet only a suspicion, rather than a fully formed theory; it is not yet ripe for presentation.—P. 41. The *an* in *rank*, *standard*, etc., may be due to Continental influence, *en* and *an* being

in France to a great extent pronounced alike; see also Skeat's remark p. 129, §96, (2). The foot note on p. 126 is not a sufficient explanation; why should *e* in *renc* have had a nasal sound any more than, or one different from that of *e* in the words which gave us *amend*, *tent*, etc.? Cf. also *sample*, pp. 66, 78. In §§58 (2), (pp. 85, 86) the matter is again mentioned; such repetitions with more or less variation are frequent and annoying. This fault is somewhat atoned for by the excellent index, in which I have noted only the omission of *use*, p. 47.—P. 41. The two important different sounds of *e* are here recognized, though the treatment is inadequate.—P. 42. In *ie* the *i* can, in general, be neglected for Anglo-French, the change of *ie* to *e* being one of the earliest of Anglo-French peculiarities. One often asks himself in reading, what period of Anglo-French is in the author's mind? The modern English spelling with *ie* is mentioned in §84. An interesting chapter might be written on Old French spellings as explaining present English spellings, and in connection with this might be discussed some cases of spelling influencing pronunciation. The *o* before *m* and *n* in Anglo-French we naturally suppose to have been *o* (*u* in England), as a general rule. The sound we give to *o* in *compass*, for example, is the regular and proper one for such cases; cf. the different pronunciations now given the *o* in *combat*. On p. 42 an explanation of the spelling with *o* instead of *u* is offered; for a discussion of the sounds as later developed, see §§65, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 87, and, perhaps, other places. The general principles are perfectly simple, and could have been briefly stated and illustrated. But I have already drawn attention to the confused treatment of the *o* and *u* sounds.—P. 43, line 3, "*u* long by position" is a phrase that ought not to be used; it is the syllable, not its vowel, that is long even with the added foot note, the vowel itself being in such cases usually short, though it may be long in spite of position.—P. 59. Either here or somewhere else (for example, in chap. xi) the difference between the final consonants in *advice* (s) and *advise* (z); *use*, n., and *use*, v.; *strife* and *strive* might have been noticed and explained, and the cases of O. Fr. -*t* and -*d*, for example, dis-

cussed for the words which English adopted. Perhaps this has been done somewhere in the book though I have not found the place; there is no doubt that the author understands the principle, see p. 194.—P. 60. The explanation given of the difference in accent between noun and verb (*conflict*, *convict*, *torment*, etc.) is interesting.—P. 64. Is it true that *scl* passed through *shl* (§1) on the way to *sl* in *scandre*, *slander*? I think not.—P. 67. *Eschaete* (for older -*eite*) is an interesting case of survival in English, through a participial noun, of the O. Fr. p. p. in -*eit*=-ēctum.—P. 70. *Coevrir*. Better to write *covrir* or *cuvrir*, in the infinitive.—P. 81. Can the sound *a* (*aa*) in *pass* and similar words be properly called a retention of the Anglo-French sound? It is rather a comparatively late modern development from the sound *æ*, itself regularly descended from Anglo-French or Middle English *a*. Middle English long *a* regularly gives us not *a* (*aa*) but *ei* (ê), and if *pass*, etc., did show a retention of the Anglo-French sound of *a* we should have a problem to solve.—P. 84 (§56). "It is weakened to short *i*." The "it" means the *e* in *el*, and not *el* itself, as the language used implies.—P. 91. The spelling *ie* for original *ue*, *oe* in *reprieve*, *retrieve* might have been mentioned here, as well as the *ie*=O. Fr. *ie*, which, as is here said, meant the close *e* sound. The reason is clear enough; namely, O. Fr. *ie* and O. Fr. *ue* both gave in English the same close *e* (ê), and the traditional spelling *ie* was sometimes used for this sound, even when the O. Fr. original did not have *ie*. In §84 the author appears to understand what he here misses a clear reason for.—P. 101 (§67). Cases like *butcher* with old *u* preserved may be compared with native words like *full*. The labial consonant is doubtless in part at least the cause; cf. *put*, *bull*, etc. In §68, (2) the modern *fool* points to a Middle English *fol*, while the O. Fr. vowel was *ø*. The change of quality may have been due to the labial *f* or to the *l*, or to both combined. The rarity of the sound *ʌ* (in *fool*) in modern English words derived from O. Fr. is easily explained, and perhaps the explanation is in this book; one expects to see it here (§68 or in the vicinity) but it is missing, and cases like *move*, *prove*, which are here mentioned ought to have

been explained. In §85 (p. 117) we find something more, but no clear explanation is given there, either.—P. 102. The cases of regular development spoken of in §69 are really not those which have the sound *o* as in *common*, *admonish*, *honor*, etc., as might be inferred, but those mentioned in §67 with the sound heard in *money*, *comfort* (first *o*).—P. 103. In *enfourmer* the *ou* is regular enough as far as the quality (Continental French *ø* not *ø*) is concerned, for the *o* was long in Latin, and is so given by Körting ('Lat.-roman. Wörterbuch').—P. 110. In *gule* the vowel was in French *ø*, not *ü*, and the word should accordingly have been put in another place, and the exceptional character of the development of English *gules* noticed.—P. 111, foot note 2. This should rather have been given as the regular mode of formation for words taken from the spoken language, and the statement of the rule might be better.—P. 113, (2). "In a few cases," it is here said, "both *ai* and *ei* have become" long *i* (as in *plea*, *treat*, etc.). There is nothing irregular about this treatment of original French diphthongal *ai* and *ei*, when they had become monophthongs in England in Middle English times, and the language used, which implies something irregular or exceptional, should have been different. Behrens has given a good statement of the laws followed, which explains why we have sometimes long *i* and sometimes *ei* (*ɛ*), as in *pay*, *vein*; see now Paul's 'Grundriss,' 1, pp. 821-823, though it need not be assumed that there are no difficulties left.—P. 113. In *receipt* the *ei* is due to the influence of *receive*, or the French original of the latter word, for the O. Fr. form from which our noun came had *ɛ* and not (originally) the diphthong. Similar is the case of *deceit*. P. 117. The form *utas* points rather to *utaves* with *ü* for *iii* than to the anomalous and, probably bad spelling, *oetaves*. The *ü=ü* shows the diphthong of the simple word *huit*. Instead of such a form as O. Fr. *retreuver*, should be given either the proper infin. *re-trover* or a form with the accent on the stem to show the diphthong *oe*, *ue*; for example, *retruevent*. So in other similar cases.—P. 119. For my own dialect *coit* is not a better spelling than *quoit*; is the pronunciation *koit* common in England, or anywhere in this country?—

§87. Only cases of a true diphthong *ou*, or at least of what was previously a diphthong *ou* should be mentioned; such as *ou* in *outrage*.—P. 120. The word *pui* was always a monosyllable in O. Fr. and would have given *pu* (with *ii*) in Anglo-French, whence English *pew* might have regularly descended. But dissyllabic Middle English *pewe* points to O. Fr. *pue*, representing a plural *podia*, and this O. Fr. *pue* is in Godefroy. We are not obliged to assume so strange a thing as that O. Fr. *pui* gave a dissyllabic form *pü-i* in Anglo-French, and that this then gave a Middle English *pewe*.—P. 123. The wording "evidently because a silent initial *h* before a stressed syllable is opposed to the habits of the language" is queer. What is meant, is that the influence of spelling on pronunciation, here shown, would not have taken place if the vowel had not been accented. But the habits of our language are not at all opposed to an un aspirated accented vowel at the beginning of a word. The spelling of the language is here confused with the language itself.—P. 124. The *z* sound in *measure* comes from *z+y*, the written *su* meaning formerly *zyu*, the *yu* being the regular descendant of Fr. *ii*. The author probably understands the matter, cf. §83, (3).—P. 125. Can the *s* in *viscount* ever have had the sound of *z*? It is difficult to believe it.—P. 127. The pronunciation marked for the Middle English form of *judge* has at least one misprint, *g* for *j*. The *u* may be intentional.—P. 128. The case of *room*, with its exceptional long *u*, is perhaps a secondary lengthening from *rum* (with *u* as in *bull*), a pronunciation known both in England and this country, and itself due, perhaps, to a previous shortening of the original long vowel, the sound *u* being then kept under the influence of the labial *m*.

The substance of Chap. vii can be indicated by saying that sounds of Anglo-French origin, the words once naturalized in English, developed regularly in the same way as the same sounds similarly situated in native words. It would be well to change or query some of the Anglo-French pronunciations given, and to revise the conclusions that follow the lists, but I have touched on some of the most important points already. I pass rapidly over Chapters viii and ix, with the interesting remarks on the

language of Chaucer, of Lydgate, of Caxton, of Shakespeare, and particularly of Dryden. Notice the misprint "phthysic" (p. 154).—P. 158. *Gimmel (-bit)* is, I believe, marked in at least one dictionary as pronounced with *g*, as in *get*; this seems to be a modern mistake.—P. 166. "*Ritornella*, as in Italian." I know only *ritornello*.—P. 173. The letter *a* in French represents two well-recognized sounds, not one only.—P. 178. The Eng. suffix *-oon* cannot be a survival of the Anglo-French form of the O. Fr. suffix *-on*; for that, if the accent had remained on the last syllable, would have given words rhyming now, as in Middle English, with *town*. The last sentence in the paragraph is unwarranted.—P. 181. To speak of the loss of a mute *l* is odd.

Chapters x, xi, xii deal with the history of French phonology. There is here far too much detail, the really essential phenomena and the most important laws not being made properly prominent. It is unfortunate that Schwan's assumption of a Gallic Low Latin sound *ω* for classic Latin *au* has been followed.—P. 193. The paragraph numbered eight, shows a lack of acquaintance with phonetics, and it is a lack which is lamentably common.—Pp. 199–204. Only the regular changes for popular words should have been given, and, for example, *e* for Latin "free tonic" *ɛ*, *æ* should have been omitted.—P. 212. What is said of *genteeel* is not exact. It is here said that the "Middle English *gentil* has split into distinct forms, according to the accent; viz., *gentle* and *genteeel*. The latter is valuable as showing a survival of the old pronunciation of E[ng]. *i*." A previous mention of *genteeel* occurs on p. 175, in the chapter on words from modern French. The inconsistency is obvious, and the incorrectness of the statement on p. 212 equally so.—P. 229 refers to "L with *y*, p. 230" for *lentil*, but no explanation is there given.—P. 231. Unintelligible is the remark about the Normans as having no difficulty in pronouncing Lat *w* (*wiperam*), when we reflect that this Latin *w* had long before become *v*, so that there was no Lat. *wipera* in existence. Was there in this case influence of a Teutonic form early borrowed from Latin and so having initial *w*?—P. 240. Schwan's remarks are on the phonology of Greek loan-words in Folk-

Latin, not in French. This should be noted lest Skeat's remark that "the Greek here spoken of is the late or Byzantine Greek, rather than that of the classical period," be understood as meaning that these words are of comparatively modern origin. Some of the words are certainly pretty old. Schwan well says that these Greek words entered Folk-Latin "zu sehr verschiedenen zeiten."—P. 284. O. Fr. *norice* is not regularly formed for the descendant of Lat. *nutricem*; see the reference given by Körting for an explanation of the real source of the O. Fr. word. This example occurs in the chapter on words of Latin origin, after the French element has been disposed of.—P. 304. It would have been better to omit the *l* for Italian, and also the line following.—P. 305. The example *justo* is not good, in that it implies that *justo* is a recognized and not uncommon Italian word, for no others ought to be used as examples. Better would be *pajo* (also spelt *pao*), or the whole line might be omitted. *Cielo* is not pronounced with a close *e*.—P. 307. The spelling *c(i)are* in *judec(i)are*, *manc(i)are* is clumsy, and not very clear. Cf. on these words Körting, 'Lat. roman. Lex.', *manduco*, with the forms and references there given.—P. 309. In *florin* (English) is not the *l* due to a Low Latin form, or to knowledge of the etymology? It would be better to omit the remark, as it implies that *florin* is Italian, or at least that the Italian word has *f*. There are several words in this chapter which suggest queries, but I pass them by with the general remark that for Italian, as for French, there is too much detail, and only really plain and clear principles should have been given and illustrated.

In the chapter on Spanish it would have been best to follow Knapp on pronunciation, instead of mixing Knapp's statements with those of P. Foerster when they are in contradiction, as in the "exceptional case" (which as such and as looking very improbable even to a tyro, should have been omitted) of the pronunciation of *escena* with *s* as Eng. *z* and *c* as Eng. *th* (in *that*), and also as in the immediately preceding remark about *z* (p. 332). Araujo's first article on Spanish pronunciation in the *Phonetische Studien* was probably unknown to Skeat when this book was publish-

ed.—P. 320. *Savanna* is not from the Greek through Lat. and Span. (cf. pp. 337, 341 for Skeat's whole view), cf. the accent of the Span. word and its meaning, see Littré, s. v. *savane* (in the *Supplément*) where; however, a correction for reference to the edition of Las Casas, 'Historia de las Indias,' now in print, Madrid, 1875-76, is called for; it is in Book I, chap. 91 or vol. ii, p. 35 that the passage occurs: "al pie del asiento de esta fortaleza está un llano gracioso, que los indios llaman *cabana*." I may also mention as of possible value in this connection an article in the New York *Nation*, 1885, vol. xl, p. 508. There is a Span. *sabana*, accented on the second syllable, which does correspond to our word, and is this *cabana* in modern spelling. *Paragon* (same page) is spoken of as from Span., while on p. 335 we see that Tobler's etymology is known to Skeat, and is spoken of as the probable solution. It should have been added, therefore, that Tobler does not derive Span. *paragon*, *parangon* immediately from Greek, but thinks the word was brought from Italy into Spain. Skeat's quotation from Minsheu (1623) does not prove that our word came immediately from Span.; it may have come from French which also had the word in the sixteenth century; it was in use in English before 1623.—P. 321. Interesting are the remarks on *garble* with the correction of Godefroy. I have already mentioned some statements about Span. pronunciation; there are also inconsistencies; cf. what is said of the sounds of *z* and *c*, p. 323, §226 (*z* pronounced as *s* is apparently considered the Spanish pronunciation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), p. 333 ("*ç=ts?*" and the remarks on Eng. *lasso*), and p. 436, where we read: "but it seems clear that in the sixteenth century, Span. *ç* and *z* both had the sound of *z* in *zone*." And in the same sentence, further on, is added: "that *ll* had the modern Italian, not the modern Spanish sound; and that *x* had the old sound of E[ng]. *x* in *mix*, though it, probably, soon passed into *sh*." The idea of different dialect developments of older *ç* and *z* might naturally have suggested itself to explain cases like *lasso*, but no such idea seems to have occurred to the author. No comment is needed on the last words quoted.

There is much that is good in this book, and the main cause for regret is that more time was not given to its preparation, so as to make it, as it might have been made, very much better. As it is, it at least contains a large number of examples, and will show the great importance of the French element in our language, and future writers on that subject will be likely to utilize much of its material, while it may be doubted whether they will have such a knowledge of Middle English as Skeat.

I have never studied any work from his hand without profit, and if in the present case the profit has been less than I had hoped, the reason is that the work was done in a field where he is not quite at home.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph.D., Litt. D., Professor of English in the College of New Jersey. Funk & Wagnall's Company, New York: 1892, 8vo, 384 pp.

The aim of Dr. Hunt's book is to counteract the chilling and repressive influence of the dominant, materialistic philosophy, as speculative and unethical, upon the poetic instincts. "If English literature comes more and more into union with modern materialism its doom is sealed." He finds "the precedent of the present tendency in the period when English Deism was at its height and the speculative reason usurped the place of simple faith."

There is no abstract discussion of the relation of morality to literature, but in the course of his historic review he shows, as they arise, that the best literary products of the English mind are ethical. The dependence of literature upon its moral contents and spirit for its power, dignity, and æsthetic value is assumed. Dewey is quoted: "no poetry can be good, even in an æsthetic sense, which is divorced from the moral principle."

He seeks to counteract the enfeebling influence of the materialistic philosophy upon English literature in particular, by showing that the constitutional bias of the mind of the English race received from the *ethical teachings*

of its first and formative period, when "the moral element is ever visible," is ethical. Its highest artistic results, in agreement with Taine's theory of art, is in the line of its own constitutional bias and spirit. The English mind will work more genially and powerfully, and achieve its highest and purest literary triumphs when it works in a moral spirit and upon moral truth.

It is not necessary for Dr. Hunt, therefore, to review the literature from the Reformation and the age of Elizabeth to show that it is distinctively ethical, with the solitary exception of the literature of the Restoration, the exceptional character of which disappears in view of the literary strength of the minority.

He limits his review to the period from Beowulf to Ascham as the first and *formative* period. He shows in a succession of most interesting chapters that, during this period, the English mind was under Christian culture, evangelical, independent, and protesting. "From the days of Cædmon to the Norman Conquest, and still on to the time of Chaucer and Caxton, most of the best prose and poetry was ethical, if not, indeed, distinctly religious in character." In regard to Beowulf, Dr. Hunt claims that the general cast of the poem is ethical. "It is more than that, and may be said to be profoundly serious and earnest." "There are tendencies and teachings far from unchristian, and which go far to establish a basis on which positively Christian doctrine may be founded." "Most of the ethical element is undoubtedly due to the Anglo-Danish paraphrast."

In distinct chapters, he reviews the Bible and Homily in Old English, Cædmon's, Bede's, Alfred's, Cynewulf's, Layamon's, Orm's, Richard de Bury's, and Richard Rolle's writings, the teachings of the School, and the church, and Old English laws and proverbs. These chapters form the First Part, in which he makes it clearly evident, as was done by Soames in his labors in this field, that the ethical teachings of the Anglo-Saxon church were evangelical, independent and protesting. Dr. Hunt refers this, in large degree, to the influence of the native British church, but allows that "the missionary movements from Rome became fully established ere departures, more

or less important, from the earliest type of the Latin church began to be manifest." Whether due to the British church or to the character of the comparatively pure Christianity of the first Roman missionaries, Anglo-Saxon Christianity maintained throughout its entire period a character quite distinct and peculiar. As has been said by an eminent authority, "of all the literatures of modern Europe, the English felt the influence of Christianity in its purest form."

In a Second Part, Dr. Hunt reviews the literature from Chaucer to Ascham, in chapters on Chaucer, the 'Cursor Mundi,' the Stage, Mandeville, Wyclif, Langland, Gower, Caxton, Latimer, Tyndale, and Ascham, with concluding chapters of great interest upon the English Bible and the English language.

It is necessary for the force of his argument that Dr. Hunt should show that the continuity of English literature was not broken by the Conquest. Here, as in his history of English prose, he maintains the continuity with great and convincing earnestness. He exhibits the transmission of these teachings, not only through tradition, but through literature, in Layamon, and Orm, and Rolle. Though much of the literature of this transitional period is translation from the French, it is the translation of the ethical writings of the French, in the ethical spirit of the English. Dr. Hunt has rescued the literature of this period from the contempt it has received as only valuable for philological uses. He does not claim for the literature of the period preceding the age of Elizabeth an artistic form. The English mind was too deeply concerned with the spirit and stuff of literature to give attention to fine form. The historic order in the development of the true, the good, and the beautiful in English literature followed the logical order. As Shedd says:

"The same degree of careful effort devoted to the artistic and formal finish of a work AFTER, instead of before, the proper diligence and care have been devoted to its material origination within the mind, will elaborate it into a high beauty and an exquisite grace, that are absolutely beyond the power of one who has not thus begun at the beginning."

This applies to the common as truly as to the individual mind. The ethical English

mind in its maturity, and in the "fulness of times," under classical influence expressed itself in the finest form.

Dr. Hunt's claim of a high ethical character for Chaucer will, perhaps, be rejected by some. Arnold deposes him from his literary position for his alleged want of seriousness. Lounsbury, in his "Studies in Chaucer," presents his views in the following abstracts: "The evidence indicates that Chaucer's mind passed through several phases, but that towards the end doubt and denial became its leading characteristics." He concedes that "the evidence is scanty" but insists that "it is equally fair to say that it cannot be expected to be otherwise than scanty." Lounsbury finds in Chaucer "an audaciousness in his reference to the Supreme Being," shocking to the devout, and "a familiarity of tone coming perilously near to the verge of blasphemy." Yet he recognizes the fact "that he was profoundly interested in the questions connected with doctrinal theology. The problems which still disquiet the intellect, and after the solution of which we grope in vain in the soul's own darkness, were the ones that were perpetually present to his mind." This seems like a concession to an ethical element in Chaucer.

Dr. Hunt has effectively shown that in each of the eras reviewed in the two parts into which his work is divided,

"a distinctive and an ever-increasing Christian element is visible; so prominent, at times, as to control the current speech, and never so in abeyance as to be without decided potency. So manifest, indeed, is this to the discerning student of our oldest literature that it is not unhistorical to say that Old English, taken as a whole, is more biblical and ethical in its tone than it is secular, and might be assigned, as to much of it, to the alcoves of theology and morals, of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology."

Dr. Hunt's work thus becomes a valuable contribution to the philosophy of English literature. He has shown in the ethical teachings of the earliest period the influence of the agencies in the formation of the established bias and spirit of the English mind, and the essential characteristic of English literature, which has made it "the most thoughtful, the most vigorous, and the most vitalizing literature of the modern world."

He refers this characteristic not to the "soil, sea, sky, and climate" of England, to which Taine so largely refers it, but, recognizing these material conditions as predisposing influences, he refers the ethical character to the providential and historic tuition of its formative period. This serves as a strong justification of the attention given to the earlier literature in English studies. The student drinks at the fountain head from the source of the power and dignity of our great literature.

CHARLES E. HART.

Rutgers College.

*

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

Studier over engelske Kasus. I Række. Med en Indledning: Fremskridt i Sproget. Af OTTO JESPERSEN, Copenhagen: Kleins Forlag, 1891. Pp. 222.

DR. JESPERSEN'S first series of studies of the English case is one of the most careful pieces of work in this direction yet produced in Danish. The author has collected a vast amount of material from the earliest to the latest period of the language, showing an intimate knowledge of our tongue that is very rare in a foreigner. His first independent work was an English grammar, published in 1885, since which time he has brought out a number of monographs on various linguistic subjects. Valuable as the treatment of the English case is, however, the chief interest of the work undoubtedly centers in the introduction, "Progress in Language," which forms more than a quarter of the whole, and in which the author attempts to prove the grammatical superiority of modern English over Old English, of analytical languages over synthetic, of root languages over inflectional. In connection with this theory, or, perhaps, as a logical consequence of it, he undertakes also to overthrow the theory that the inflectional, agglutinative and root families of languages represent three stages of development, of which the last is the most primitive.

To take up the first question, the superiority of modern English to old English as a means of communication. While the author is perfectly correct in his statement that speech is the effort to make one's meaning intelligible and that, therefore, "that language stands

highest that accomplishes most with the least means" his enthusiasm for his subject makes him go altogether too far. It is no doubt true that "a result of inflections is irregularities, exceptions," but he seems to forget that the lack of inflection leads to precisely the same trouble. Thus the whole system of concord, which, as Jespersen says, is a necessary accompaniment of inflection, while causing mental effort to the speaker, certainly serves to make the meaning clearer to the hearer. It takes at least two persons to make a conversation, that is, an interchange of ideas, and the claims of the one are quite as urgent as those of the other. To cite one example, which figures in almost every English Rhetoric as a violation of clearness: "And thus the son the fervid sire addres'd." The use of a separate form for nominative and accusative would clear up the ambiguity immediately. The presence of inflectional forms often causes awkwardness, especially in the use of the pronoun, but this is not sufficient to prove the superiority of an analytical to a synthetic language. Dr. Jespersen's Z. E. D. is by no means a necessary conclusion.

In attempting to disprove the theory of the primitiveness of root languages, Dr. Jespersen has recourse to a family of languages whose study is comparatively rare, that of South Africa. In one of these he finds a very complicated system of inflection, in some respects more complicated and consistent than that of any of the Indo-European languages. Especially is this the case with the so-called "representative elements," or prefixes, which are reducible to separate classes, their use being strictly limited by the construction. Particularly interesting is the author's too brief comparison of Bruoccotti & Vetralle's grammar of one of these languages written two hundred years ago with Bleek's grammar of the language in its present state, which shows a decided simplification of the forms. Jespersen concludes, furthermore, that it is possible to find in these languages the growth of the pronominal idea and of many other grammatical forms. He concludes, and this is the turning point of the whole argument, that this grammatical development has been effected in every case by a shortening and

simplification, instead of by an expansion. Therefore, if this be the case with a primitive language like the Hottentot or the Zulu, why cannot the same hold good of all other languages? "Simplicity in linguistic formation . . . is, therefore, not original but derived" (p. 41). In support of the statement as regards the Indo-European family, he quotes from Brugmann's treatise on the gender of the noun and Johan Schmidt's 'Die Pluralbildung der indog. Neutra.' Paul, in his 'Principles of the History of Language,' to whom Jespersen does not refer, does not, however, seem to lend support to any such belief, though no more direct statement than the following can be found in his great work:

"we cannot, of course, suppose that analogy co-operated in this manner in the case of the first creations with which language began. No trace of any grammatical category is seen in them. They answer to entire conceptions. They are primitive sentences of which we may form an idea from such sentences as fire! thieves! spoken in a single word." (P. 184).

Dr. Jespersen is by no means alone in his theory that Chinese may be regarded as representing the last stage in a series of linguistic changes. While J. Edkins in his work 'The Evolution of the Chinese Language' (1888), still clings to the old idea, Lepsius, writing thirty-one years ago, and Ernst Kuhn but nine years ago, come to the directly opposite conclusion, that Chinese has not always been a root language. Jespersen, however, again goes too far when he claims that it would be impossible for a primitive people to employ so logical a system of language as that of the Chinese, in which each word has its fixed position.

Curiously enough, the only misstatement with regard to linguistic forms noticed, concerns the author's own tongue. It is not correct to say that "in the present Danish speech we distinguish the singular and plural of *Dag* only by the presence or absence of the stop tone." I am sure that the most careless speaker would pronounce *Dage* as a dissyllable, although the final -e is frequently very indistinct. In the study of the English pronouns, to which this first series is devoted, the author has shown both skill in his choice of selections and care in their reproduction.

Even the varying forms of the Early and Middle English are given with absolute correctness. On page 177, Dr. Jespersen has introduced a very useful phonetic term into Danish, *stummelse* (voicing), for which his apologetic foot note is hardly necessary. The discussion of the confusion in the use of the nominative and objective is particularly sound and valuable for Danish readers. It is somewhat in the nature of a defence of the position taken by the author in his English grammar, for the schoolmaster is abroad in Denmark as well as in America. Jespersen's treatment of the Scandinavian influence on Old English (p. 97) is remarkably temperate for a Dane. His suggestion that Einenkel's frequently excessive claims for French influence on English syntax may often be disproved by citing similar Danish constructions, is valuable, even though, as he himself admits, such resemblances do not necessarily imply direct Scandinavian influence. Not the least virtue of the work is the admirable table of contents, which almost takes the place of an index. Dr. Jespersen's second series will be looked forward to with interest.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

POETRY AND PHILOSOPHY.

Kuno Fischer und die litterarhistorische Methode. Von HUGO FALKENHEIM, DR. PHIL. Berlin: Speyer & Peters, 1892, pp. 107.

THE object of Falkenheim's monograph, as set forth in the Preface, is to attempt to establish the principles of a method which shall be a guide to a scientific understanding and appreciation of German poetry. Its rather strange title is due to the fact, that the author believes to have discovered these principles in the critical works of Kuno Fischer on Lessing, Schiller and Goethe. The title is not a happy one, as it may arouse the opposition of some critics to whom Kuno Fischer is not a *persona grata*; furthermore, it is misleading. For the value of the essay lies in the principles of literary criticism deduced from Fischer's books, and not in the discussion and analysis of Fischer's methods.

It would be impossible within the limits of a

book review to discuss, or even comment upon, principles of such far-reaching importance, for this would require at least as much space as the author has taken for their exposition. As such a method, however, cannot be limited to German literature, but is universal in its application, it will not be without value to follow the main lines of the views here presented, in the hope that the presentation of these may lead to a careful reading of the book, which is full of suggestions on all matters pertaining to the critical study of literature, though all might not agree with its chief deductions.

The author asserts, as the underlying principle of his method, that poetry and philosophy are intimately connected in their nature. This principle he demonstrates by an analysis of the character of both, and by the fact, that so many German poets have written purely philosophical works, and that all poets have embodied in their poetic creations great philosophic principles, and in their poetry have touched upon all the great problems of human life. Therefore, without the foundation of a knowledge of philosophy, the domains of classical German literature cannot be explored in their full extent; and, if literary criticism rejects philosophic thinking, that is, the philosophic method, it cannot rise to the full appreciation of its problems, and, hence, cannot solve them. The study of the history of literature is a philosophic process; it consists in investigating the principles of the internal development and the organic growth of literature. He who would write a history of literature must combine the qualities of the historian, of the psychologist and of the literary critic pure and simple. Every author must be considered from three standpoints. He must be viewed in relation to his nation; must be assigned his proper place in the history of that nation's literature and civilization. He must be discussed as the man, as a personality. He must be considered as the poet, or rather his works must be judged by themselves as artistic productions, and criticised from the purely literary standpoint. The relative importance of these elements of literary judgment varies, but they all require consideration.

Now, in regard to the first point. No judg-

ment can be fairly passed upon any author without a clear understanding of his relations to his nation and to his own times; whether or not he is in sympathy with the spirit of the times, and how far he helps to solve its great problems and to advance the cause of civilization and progress. To such an understanding, a thoroughly philosophical knowledge of that nation's history is necessary, particularly of its literary history. The great poets stand for and embody, so to speak, that which is greatest and best in their times, and, like heirs, take up and carry forward the work of civilization from one generation to another in unbroken succession. There is then a historical dependence of poets upon another, which shows itself in similar views, in similar subjects, in similar *motifs*, which are transmitted from one to another, perhaps directly borrowed. But the present tendency to attach such great importance to the discovery of such similarities is utterly wrong. For, from a strictly historical standpoint, such discoveries are of value only as they throw light upon the state of thought and culture of the period in question, or upon the general trend of the intellectual life of the nation.

But the poet has an existence and a history apart from that of his nation. To pass judgment upon him, it is, therefore, necessary to know him as an individual personality, as a "spiritual monad," and to know his personal development. Two things are necessary to such knowledge: a psychological analysis of the poet's inborn character and talents; and further, a detailed knowledge of his antecedents and of the facts of his personal history. The mere knowledge of facts, without any understanding of their bearing upon the development of the author as a man and poet, is fruitless; and the collection and compilation of such facts is almost useless labor.

In regard to the relation existing between the external facts of a poet's life and his poetry, Falkenheim holds, that poetry is the expression of the inward life of the poet and not mere reproduction of impressions from nature. All impressions from the outside world pass through the prism of poetic imagination and receive their coloring from this. Many writers on literature utterly fail to ap-

preciate this, and are lead to commit all kinds of extravagances in their attempts to fix minutely the persons who have furnished traits for the poet's characters, or to establish the exact scenes of his poems. The critic needs a philosophical mind to appreciate the transforming power of poetic fancy, to estimate correctly the influence of external events upon the development of the poet's genius, to recognize the close relation between life and poetry without binding himself to the dogma, that art and poetry merely reproduce nature and do nothing more.

A poet's life and his works, however, stand in a close relation, inasmuch as the latter are the result of agitated states of the mind, which seeks by poetic creation to free itself from its passions. Therefore, all poetry is a "Confession" and, to understand the poet's soul-life and inner development, it is necessary to analyse his poetry with this fact in view. Such psychological analysis, moreover, frequently establishes the relations between different poems, or parts of the same poem, with greater certainty than can be reached by external evidence. External evidence is of value, but how misleading it may prove is shown by the great mistakes which have been made in the discussion of the "Faust-question" by the keenest of critics.

With the present tendency of literary investigation to devote almost all its time and labor to the searching out of the "sources" of poetical works, to seeking to trace to their origin all episodes, ideas and passages which a poet may have gathered in his reading of other poets and utilised in his own works, Falkenheim has little sympathy. Such studies frequently lead to the greatest absurdities, besides failing entirely to take into account the creative imagination of the poet. Aside from the fact, that various explanations may be frequently found for such similarities of thought and expression, we are not so much interested in knowing where the poet found his materials as in knowing what use he has made of them. A philosophical method of criticism puts a just estimate upon the value of such material; the philological method, as now applied, unduly magnifies its importance and is apt to mislead the student. It is a mistake

of the same general nature to group poets into "schools," to assert dogmatically the dependence of one poet upon another, to cite indiscriminately analogous and contradictory passages of the same or of different poets. All such practices are misleading, because they are apt to lose sight of the power of originality in the poetic imagination.

Literary criticism, pure and simple, the third of the elements of literary judgment, when based upon careful preliminary historical and psychological analysis, is, according to Falkenheim, the consummation of literary investigation. For the history of literature "reaches its highest point when conceived of as the history of the development of national æsthetic ideals in the realm of poetry as reflected in the representative poets and their works." In practice, the process of passing judgment upon any author is as follows. First comes the critical estimate of his productions, an estimate corrected and ratified by the facts of his life, and then the author is assigned his proper rank amongst the poets of his nation. Therefore, purely literary criticism is the Alpha and the Omega of literary investigation.

Literary criticism requires taste and discrimination, intuitive æsthetic appreciation, a soul which is itself poetical. Mechanical dissection can never comprehend life. The first thing to be aimed at in the interpretation of any poem is to understand its spirit, its organic structure, and not, as the philologists of to-day would have it, its form or its style. Form is secondary to thought; the critic should pass criticism upon the *union of form and thought*, to explain how the poet cast into its harmonious form this creation of his "fine phrenzy."—Philology has its place in literary investigations, often the most important place, and should do the preliminary work in all literary study; but it ought not, on the ground of being the "exact" method, assert its superiority over all other methods, which, because they are not mechanical, it contemptuously calls unscientific. All honor is due to philology, because it has so rigidly insisted upon accuracy and attention to detail, but to-day it is lost in its details and fails to see the woods because of the trees.

The great objection urged against æsthetic

literary criticism is its indefiniteness. It cannot be defined exactly; it is difficult to resolve it into its elements, to establish canons of criticism which will be accepted by all. The objection is partly true, yet receives most of its support from mistakes of incapable critics. Scientific criticism requires a naturally critical mind educated in the principles of art and philosophy, trained by a study of artistic productions. There are general laws underlying all poetic creations according to which the poet's mind works and creates, and which it is the aim of æsthetics to discover in order to base upon them canons of criticism. There are certain of these views accepted by all writers in literary matters, for all make distinctions between greater and lesser poets, and none would think of chronicling *all* facts about *all* authors. The criticism of a poem requires more than mere analysis. Having penetrated to the heart of the poem and discovered the law of its organism, the critic should proceed to the reconstruction, the *synthesis*, of the poem according to its organic laws. In this process he can appreciate the value of its form, can judge whether form and thought are in harmony, can condemn such parts as are not in keeping with, or extraneous to, the rest of the poem.

Falkenheim sums up his results as follows:

"The justification of our method lies in the fact that while it attempts to find the solution of the problems of the history of literature by an analysis of the peculiar character and nature of this history, it avoids the one-sidedness of former methods, of which, however, it preserves the important features and which it takes up and embodies in newer and higher principles. . . . In such a method the spirit always counts for more than the letter."

He acknowledges that there are weak points in the method, that Kuno Fischer, its great exponent, is often one-sided, and, perhaps, dogmatic, but maintains that the method, if properly applied, is its own check.

Such, in the main, are the views of the author. Whatever opinion may be held of the worth and correctness of his views, the author is entitled to great praise for the honesty and fairness of his discussion; the clear, logical exposition of his views and his straightforward, agreeable style. Kuno Fischer, as the best

representative of the method, necessarily takes up a great deal of space in the discussion, and his books furnish many illustrative examples. The tone, however, in which the "master" is spoken of, is always moderate; there is in it the warm feeling of a devoted pupil towards his teacher, but nowhere fulsome flattery or dogmatic condemnation of dissenting opinions. The great merit of the book is, that it joins so vigorously and powerfully in the increasing protests against the mechanical, life-destroying methods of literary criticism which are prevalent in Germany and threaten to reduce the investigation and study of literature in our colleges and universities to the merest mechanical grubbing for facts, without any consideration of the thought and beauty of the poetic creations.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Yale University.

ICELANDIC LEXICOGRAPHY.

Ordförrådet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna leksikaliskt och grammatiskt ordnat av Dr. LUDVIG LARSSON. Lund: Ph. Lindstedts Universitets-Bokhandel. 1891, 4to, pp. v, 438.

DR. LARSSON'S work is a decidedly valuable addition to Icelandic lexicography, filling a want that had long been felt. It contains complete references to all forms occurring in the following MSS.:

1. Reykjaholts málðage, or málðagi, as it is written in the MS. itself.
2. Arnamagnsan MS., 237 fol.
3. The oldest portion of Codex 1812, 4to, Gl. Kong. Saml.
4. The glossaries in the Arnamag. MS., 249 fol.
5. 15, 4to, Stockholm. Book of Homilies.
6. Fragments of "Phisiologus, Arnamag." MS., 673 A, 4to.
7. The older portion of Arnamag. MS., 645, 4to.
8. Arnamag. MS., 674, 4to, A.
9. " " 673, 4to, B.
10. " " 315, fol. D.

The last three MSS. contain respectively *Eleucidarius*, *Placitusdrápa* and *Grágás*.

Some idea of the magnitude of the work and the minuteness of its execution can be formed from the statement that the references to the single word *af* in its various uses cover over twelve columns, one of these columns containing, by actual count, four hundred and twenty-five references, while the pronoun *sá* takes up twenty columns, or between eight and ten thousand references. The form of the catch words is normalized according to the oldest orthography that commonly occurs in the MSS., while the different forms of the same word are arranged according to their age, and when this is the same the least abbreviated form is given first. The different MSS. are, furthermore, treated separately, convenient abbreviations being employed to distinguish them. At the back of the book are lists of foreign proper names and common nouns that do not receive Icelandic inflectional endings. Finally, all the native words occurring in the dictionary are grammatically arranged in accordance with Noreen's 'Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik.' This is especially valuable in connection with the nouns.

A careful comparison of the words under the letter *A* with those occurring in Vigfussen's Dictionary shows the following omissions and errors in the latter and, at the same time, indicates the usefulness of Larsson's work, especially for grammatical purposes:—

akenningsr, masc., given only as fem., -*ing*.
aldentré, *algeorva*, *almildr*, *ástfrænncona*,
ásthuge (*ástarhúge*, however, is given by V.),
ástskýrpr, *astvitispr*.

As the value of a work of this kind depends entirely upon the correctness of its references, I have compared the forms occurring in the Icelandic-Latin glossary, numbered Gl. ii., with Dr. Larsson's transcriptions, and for want of a more complete comparison, this may be taken as a fair test of the compiler's skill. The forms are cited from the edition published in "Smaastykker" of the society for the publication of Old Norse Literature, 1884, by Gudmund Þorláksson. This particular work was chosen mainly on account of its shortness. Under 'af, casus osäker,' it should be noted that the case, dative sing., is given in the

citation of the governed word *samhuilo*; *bolle* is omitted, though *hlannbolle* is cited from 1812; *i*, which is given as uncertain as regards the case, governs the acc., according to the reference to *hel*. There are, furthermore, several words, *hor hus*, *fe hus*, written as one word in the dictionary, that occur as separate words in the text. If, however, the rest of the work is as carefully done as this portion examined, and a hasty comparison of portions of the *Maldagi* and of 1812 would indicate that it is, Dr. Larsson is to be congratulated on having successfully performed a most difficult and troublesome task. It should be noted, in conclusion, that the mechanical execution of the work is admirable, the paper being good and plenty of it, the print large and clear.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BEEKENES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The number for September 20th, 1892, of *L'Intérmédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux* (which occasionally discusses points of philological interest with its historical and literary contents) has the following:—

"Un vieux mot du XIV^e siècle.—Parmi les copies rapportées de Londres par Brequigny, à la fin du siècle dernier, se trouve, sous la date de 1398, une requête au roi et au parlement d'Angleterre, par le trésorier de Calais, au sujet des réparations nécessaires au port de cette ville. Je relève dans ce document le passage suivant :

Y sont deux grosses overaignes les plus nécessaires de tout dys estre sustenuz et supporzet; c'est assavoir les *beekenes* devant le port illocques et le lieu appelle Paradys, q'est bien près les fosses de mesmes la ville.

Dans notre vieux français, quel est le sens de ce mot *beekenes* qui est reproduit quatre fois dans le document en question? Il s'agit très probablement d'un môle (angl. mole, head), ou d'une jetée, estacade; mais les vieux noms de ces ouvrages n'ont aucun rapport avec *beekenes*.

E. M.

This raises an interesting question, as neither Littré nor other authorities furnish the word

nor forms akin to it, and as state documents, particularly those dealing with ordinary public works or improvements, scarcely employ "verba insolita," but use terms either well-known or of easy interpretation by the general run of governmental servants. Yet it would seem, as I have communicated to the *Intérmédiaire*, that the meaning of the word is both simple and sure, since the sound, and the sense of the context each furnish an analogy with which to start. *Beekenes* is evidently the M. E. *bekene*, found in 'P. Plowman,' B. xvii, 262 (quoted by Skeat), and the equivalent of the A.-S. *beacen*, and the modern *beacon* (kindred with *beck* and *beckon*). If we accept the derivation assigned (cf. Skeat), whose radical has, besides the idea of "signal," that of "fire" as the means of communicating the sign, the connection between the root and the specific words in French: (1) 'falot'; (2) 'fanal'; (3) 'phare' would be quite as possible and probable as the derivation of *beacon* through a reduplicated *vqa* or, anteriorly, *vBHA*; since *beekenes* would then = 'phare' (whose historic origin does not invalidate the principle). But the term must have been of English importation. For (a) English political predominance at the time naturally affected the districts subject to it in France; and (b) it is no mere coincidence that the passage quoted from 'P. Plowman' should be exactly contemporaneous with the date assigned. If I recall rightly, texts A, B, C (the last fixed by its reference to Richard), all fall within the compass of the same half-century which shows the French word. Putting together derivation and the two historical side-lights—more of which could, doubtless, be verified—we may say with safety that *beekenes* = 'beacons,' that is, the 'phares' of Calais, "devant le port illocques."

On the other hand, but with less certainty, we might assign another source for the word [tho' noticing that it must be of Northern origin, as neither the Centre (cf. Jaubert) nor the 'Midi' have forms of affinity, nor do we find the slightest resemblances in Provençal speech]. The 'Patois du Nord' has *la becque*, 'le ruisseau.' This is evidently from the German *Bach*, English *Beck*, whose Dutch form *Beek* might give us the start in *beekenes*.

For (1) that an unaccented syllable should have dropped from some lost word which might have had connection with *beck*, 'stream,' in its more Teutonic forms, is not impossible, nor (2) that, granting *beek* to keep its meaning of 'rivulet,' this short form might not have been assimilated to *beacon*, which (a) constant contact with sailors along the shores of the German ocean could have transported to the Calais district, or, (b) the continuous domination of the English would have incorporated into the language, especially in official relations; the more so, as similarity of sound would lead to confusion of the idea involved, and the difference between the jetty supporting the *beacon*, and the stream itself projecting into the sea, is not so wide as to avoid possible misconception. Nor is this view without greater foundation than chance or the analogy of what has often been the result of a mistaken law of assimilation. For (cf. Godefroy, 'Dict. l'Anc. Lang. Franç.') we find *la beke*, or *la becque*, in the sense of 'égout,' 'sewer,' where (a) the connection with the point just indicated, is clear, the *beck* or 'stream' emptying itself, and then, by extension, the word becoming applied to artificial exits or conduits. Whence, (b) assimilation with the English word, by metonymy, taking the *beacon* at the end of the mole to indicate the mole itself, and then the same confusion of terms arising as above.

But, three, we find in a long passage (too much so for quoting) cited from the "Ordonnances des Rois de France, T. ii," 207 (cf. La Curne de Sainte Palaye, 'Dict. Hist. de l'Ancien Language François'), the word *bec* or *becques*, meaning in this connection 'la crête d'un fossé' 'une levée de terres' where *bec*=*beak* (Eng.) and the idea of the definition is perfectly plain, *bec* being the crest of earth, mountain or ditch, as *bec*, 'nose,' is the projection of the face. The same process would here occur; *beeken* being the projection either upward or outward, from the view of the horizontal or vertical, and assimilation occurring through confusion of sound. The last two suggestions may be fanciful to too great a degree. They are not impossible. And in the predominance of English rule, where particularly improvements would be affected by Saxon phraseology, it is more than likely that

in the clash of two related ideas, the terms of like sound would meet, victory remaining with the term of the official side. For it must be noticed, also, that each of these three interpretations makes sense in the passage at the head, translating by either 'beacons' or 'sewers' or 'ditches,' and all (the first two especially) being possible "devant le port." In fact, in "le lieu Paradys, bien près les fosses de mesmes la ville," may we not find a reference of definition to the *beekenes* of the previous clause, which would go towards meaning three?

In the lack of positive proof, the point has interested me. Perhaps further light may be shed upon it by calling attention to it, though, to my own mind, at least, one proof seems present in what I have indicated under one.

A. GUYOT CAMERON.

Yale University.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Dr. Sauveur has always maintained that living languages can be treated as vital things, communicated and received as living agents, instead of being handled like dried specimens that represent a life foreign to our age. The latest edition of 'La Parole Française'* shows a growth that must add to the utility of the book. Following the plan adopted in the 'Petites Causeries' and the 'Causeries avec mes Elèves,' the author has expanded the brief exercises connected with each chapter into a series of interesting and carefully graded familiar talks, based on the successive chapters for translation into French. To these are added a clever verb-drill on the leading irregular verbs, the two interesting *contes* of Perrault, "Cendrillon" and "La Petit Ponct," a table of comparative French and English sounds, and a vocabulary, the two latter additions being the work of Professor Samuel Garner, of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

There is so skilful a balancing of the two languages here, such an adjustment of the

**La Parole Française, Suivie de Devoirs et Traductions pour les Classes.* Par L. Sauveur. New York: F. W. Christern, 1892, 12mo, pp. 195.

receptive and the productive in interesting and varied conversation, and so harmonious a blending of grammar and every-day language, that the book is sure to accomplish its object. It stands midway between the two other books already cited, and is adapted especially for use in large classes where the aim is to master quickly a large amount of available, every-day language, spoken and written, and to acquire facility in rapid reading.

SUSAN C. LOUGEY.
Roxbury High School (Boston.)

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—To a class commencing French and using ‘Petites Causeries’ one always teaches certain principles of French Grammar, but what has hitherto been accomplished with difficulty and at a great expense of time and strength, can now be satisfactorily achieved by using the ‘Premières Leçons*’ in connection with ‘Petites Causeries.’ The plan of this little book seems to me admirable; one accustomed to use the ‘Natural Method’ will find here not only an efficient guide, but a practical support. The table of English words given to represent the elementary French sounds is well adapted to its purpose; the affirmative, negative and interrogative forms of the verb are introduced in a way to help a scholar without confusing him; he is led into a knowledge of the four conjunctions so gradually that the well-arranged table of irregular verbs has no terrors for him. The bit of French at the beginning of each lesson, from which so much grammar is developed, may be also used for dictation, for memorizing and always for conversation.

ANNIE T. SMITH.
High School, Burlington, Vt.

BRIEF MENTION.

A valuable addition has been made by Macmillan & Co. (London, New York) to the general stock of books for the use of practical teachers, in ‘French Dialogues, A Systematic Introduction to the Grammar and Idiom of Spoken French’ by Johan Storm, Professor of Romance Philology in the University of

**Premières Leçons de Grammaire*, Par Marie-Louise Sauveur et Susan C. Lougee. New York: F. W. Christern, 1892. 12mo, pp. 118.

Christiania. Intermediate course: Authorised English Edition by Geo. Macdonald of Balliol College, Oxford. The French and English texts are arranged in parallel columns on the same page, the English equivalent being given on the right. Many American instructors of French are familiar with this work as adapted to some European language outside of English; the original Norwegian edition (also the second edition in this language), together with the Danish and Swedish, was published in 1887; the German and the Dutch followed in 1888; the second Danish and the Finnish in 1889; the second Swedish and Dutch, in 1891 and 1892 respectively. We are told in the English editor’s preface that “the French text and the footnotes include the author’s latest additions and improvements.” This text represents the combined judgment of practical teachers, native French and Norse, among the former of whom the name of Paul Passy is conspicuous, who revised the proofs and made useful suggestions; and the belief is expressed that every precaution has been taken to make the work as correct and idiomatic as possible. The English part, too, is the result of consultation with Fellows of Balliol and Merton Colleges, with a native French and an English teacher of French.—The author gives the purpose of his work in the following words:

“My book is not meant for mere beginners . . . It is . . . intended in the first instance for advanced pupils, in Norway for boys at the gymnasium, young students and the general public. . . . The great majority of the dialogues have been composed by myself. The material has been accumulated during a lengthened period, partly by direct observation and partly from literature, especially plays.”

Holding these points in view, the treatise is to be especially recommended for its sound method and the abundance and variety of material presented. (8vo, 218 pp. Price \$1.10.)

D. C. Heath & Co. have added to their *Modern Language Series* a new set of ‘Exercises in French Composition.’ These are due to Angusta C. Kimball and are based on Daudet’s story ‘la Belle Nivernaise.’ They are intended for pupils in their third or fourth year of study and, consequently, present more difficulties than those which have appeared previously in this series. 24 pp., 12 cts.

PERSONAL.

George Maritz Wahl has been appointed Assistant Professor of Modern Languages in Williams College (Williamstown, Mass.). Mr. Wahl's early training was received in Germany, where he attended the Gymnasium of Arnstadt and the Universities of Leipsic and Halle. In 1881 he received the degree of M. A. from Rutgers College (New Brunswick, N. J.), and in 1891 that of L. H. D. from the same institution. From 1873-79 he was engaged in teaching in a preparatory school of New Brunswick (N. J.), and from 1879-92 was master of Modern Languages in Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass. Prof. Wahl has prepared a revision of 'Otto's Elementary German Grammar,' and written the following articles: "The German Gymnasium in its working order" (*Atlantic Monthly*, 1889); "The German Boy at Leisure" (*ibid.*, 1889); "Fürst Bismarck" (*Harper's Magazine*, 1890).

Dr. Daniel Kilham Dodge (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vols. i, p. 128 and iv, p. 227) has been appointed to the Chair of the English Language and Literature at the University of Illinois (Champaign).

Dr. Henry R. Lang (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, pp. 127, 191) has been appointed Assistant Professor of Romance Languages in Yale University (New Haven, Conn.).

Dr. Hugo A. Rennert has been appointed Assistant Professor of Romance Languages at the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), where he received the B. A. degree. He had been some time Instructor in French and German in his Alma Mater, when, at the close of 1890-91 he was granted leave of absence for a year's study in Europe, and he availed himself of this favorable opportunity to take the doctor's degree at the University of Freiburg in Baden. For this degree he presented a thesis entitled: "The Spanish Pastoral Romances," (cf. *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association*, Vol. vii, No. 3).

E. L. Richardson has been appointed Instructor in Romance Languages at Vanderbilt University (Nashville, Tenn.). Mr. Richardson was graduated at Indiana University in 1891, and spent the last academic year (1891-92) at Leland Stanford Junior University, where he received the A. M. degree. He has written "Further Notes to Gaston Paris' 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland'" (MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. vii, pp. 156-157).

Edward E. Hale, Jr. (Ph. D., Halle, 1892) is now Professor of English at the State University of Iowa. Mr. Hale's chief work in Germany was linguistic in character under Sievers and Brandl. His dissertation, how-

ever, was upon a literary subject, "Die Chronologische Anordnung der Dichtungen Robert Herrick's." Halle, 1892.

OBITUARY.

THEODOR WISÉN.

ON the fifteenth of February of this year, Theodor Wisén, Professor of Old Norse at the University of Lund, Sweden, died after a short illness. Wisén was born in the parish of Vissefjärda, Sweden, March 31st, 1835. After devoting himself, with marked success, to the study of the classics, especially Greek, he suddenly turned his attention to the subject that was destined to become his life work, and in 1865 he was appointed to the professorship that he held at the time of his death. He is said by those who had the privilege of listening to him, to have had a remarkable faculty for kindling enthusiasm in his auditors, and both in the class room and in the seminary established by him, he was always sure of attracting a goodly number of the students of Lund University.

As an author, Wisén is perhaps best known by his edition of the 'Homiliu-bok,' (Lund, 1872) for which he received, two years later, the prize of the Swedish Royal Academy. In 1881, he published through the *Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Literatur*, a collection of Icelandic rhymed poems under the title of 'Riddara-rimur,' the able introduction to which is of special value. Five years later, appeared a more extensive work on Icelandic poetry entitled 'Carmina Norræna,' containing text, commentary and a study of the metres, followed in 1889 by a glossary. Besides these three works, Wisén published a number of monographs, for the most part on Icelandic poetry, in various philological journals.

Wisén did not confine himself to his specialty. In 1889 he assisted in the publication of the second edition of the 'Orðlista' of the Academy. Some years before this he took an active part in the movement to continue the publication of the great dictionary of the Academy, being appointed the editor in chief. The actual editorship he transferred to K. F. Söderwall, retaining, however, a general supervision of the work. A specimen sheet of the dictionary was issued last winter, but to judge from the magnitude of the plan the first volume will probably not appear for some years. While Wisén's influence has been most deeply felt in his native land, his death is regretted by all lovers of the noble northern tongue in which he wrought so well.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois



JOURNAL NOTICES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCHE PHILOLOGIE. VOL. XXIV, NO. 1.—**Sijmons, B.**, Siegfried und Brunhild.—**Seeger, J.**, Über die 'neutralen Engel' bei Wolfram von Eschenbach und bei Dante.—**Koestlin, J.**, Beiträge aus Luther's Schriften zum Deutschen Wörterbuche.—**Zingerle, J. v.**, Predigtliteratur des 17. Jhs. I.—**Göltner, W.**, Konrad Hofmann.—**Minor, J.**, Ein Brief Schillers.—**No. 2.—Slebs, Th.**, Beiträge zur deutschen Mythologie. I. Der Todesgott, ahd. Hennō Wōtan—Mercurius.—**Pappenheim, M.**, Zum *ganga undir jartarmen*.—**Jelitteles und Lewy**, Zum Spruch von den zehn Altersstufen des Menschen.—**Streicher, O.**, Zur Entwicklung der mhd. Lyrik.—**Kawerau, G.**, Neue Belege für den Gebrauch von *thāte*—mhd. *entate* bei Luther.—**Krause, G.**, Ein Brief Gottscheds an den Königsberger Professor Flottwell.—**Borinski, K.**, Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutsch-romani-schen Sektion der 41. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner zu München.—**No. 3.—Jaekel, H.**, Die Hauptgöttin der Istvaeen.—**Kluge, H.**, Aar und Adler.—**Erdmann, O.**, Zu den kleineren ahd. Denkmälern.—**Tingerle, I.**, Predigtliteratur des. 17. Jhs. II.—**Powel, J.**, Ungedruckte Briefe Herders und seiner Gattin an Gleim.—**Jellinghaus, H.**, Bericht über die 16. Jahressammlung des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung in Lübeck am 19. und 20. Mai 1891.

ARKIV FÖR NORDISK FILOLOGI. NEW SERIES. VOL. IV. PART 2.—**Bær, R. C.**, Über die Qvar-Odds saga.—**Noreen, Adolf**, Bidrag til den fornordiska slutartikelns historia.—**Morgenstern, Gustav**, Zur Überlieferung der grossen Olafssaga Tryggwasonar.—**Beckman, Natanael**, Om y-typen som tecken för ändelsevokaler i Skandinna Träst. Ett bidrag till fornsvenskans långa ändelsevokaler.—**Noreen, Ad.**, Bidrag till äldre Västgötalagens tätstkriftik. II.—**Unger, R. C.**, Bemärkninger om nogle islandske og norske Haandskrifter fra Middlealderen.—**Wisen, Theodor**, Anmålan av "Andreas Heusler, Der Ljópháthr. Eine metrische Untersuchung."—**Cederschiöld, Gustaf**, Anmålan av "Håndskriftet Nr. 23654: to (Codex Regius af den äldre Edda). Udg. ved Ludv. F. A. Wimmer og Finnur Jónsson."—**Lund, Otto**, Nekrolog över G. F. V. Lund.

Idem. VOL. IV. PART 3.—**Porkelsson, Jón**, Islandiske håndskrifter i England og Skotland.—**Magnússon, Eiríkr**, Kodex Skardensis af postulasögur.—**Boer, R. C.**, Weiteres zur Qvar-Odds saga.—**Kock, Axel**, Språkhistoriska bidrag 1-III.—**Lind, E. H.**, Bibliografi för år 1890.—**Detter, Ferdinand**, Anmålan av "Die Eddische Kosmogonie, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kosmogonie des Altertums und des Mittelalters von Dr. Elard Hugo Meyea."

Idem. VOL. IV. PART 4.—**Jónsson, Finnur**, Navnet *Ljóðaháthr* og andre versarters navne, samt rettelser i texten i Codex regius af Snorres Edda.—**Eggert, Ó. Brun**, Athuganir og leiðréttningar við Stutrlunga sögu.—**Olrík, Axel**, Er Uffesagnet indvandret fra England?—**Cederschiöld, Gustaf**, Nekrolog över Theodor Wisén.—**Morgenstern, Gustav**, Notizen.—**Kock, Axel**, Anmålan av "Robert Larsson, Södermannalagens språk I. Ljudlittera."

Idem. VOL. V, PART I. **Jónsson, Finnur**, Mytiske forestillinger i de äldste skjaldekvad.—**Cederschiöld, G.**, Har Qvar Odds saga länat från Magus saga?—**Geete, Robert**, En sevensk Trojasaga från 1529.—**Koch, Axel**, Behandlingen av fornsvenskt kora y-ljud och supradentalers invärkkan på vokalisationen.—**Kälund, Kr.**, Kulturhistorisk-lexikolske smiting.—**Beckman, Nat.**, Till vocalbalansen a: á (o) i fornsvenskans sydligare dialekter.—**Cederschiöld, Gustaf**, Am komparationen af fornisländska adjektiv på -legr (*ligr*) och adverb på -lega (-liga).—**Dahlerup, Verner**, Anmålan av "Ludvig Larsson; Ordförrådet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna leksikaliskt och grammatiskt ordnat."

DANIA, TIDSSKRIFT FOR FOLKEMÅL OG FOLKE-MINDER. VOL. I, PART 4.—**Olrík, Axel**, Dansk folk-mindelitteratur 1891.—**Jespersen, Otto**, Sproglige Kuriosa.—**Nielsen, Anton**, Smatræk af livet i ældste tider.—**Nyrop, Kr.**, Skomageren og kalven.—**Olrík, Axel**, Nyere tysk litteratur om Sigurd of Brynhild.—**Jespersen, Otto**, En prisopgave.—**Kruger, J. K.**, Sel-landske sprogpøver.—Småting og Forespørgsler.—Endnu engang "fore" (Jsp.).—**Pottænsch (Kr. N.)**, Hovmanden od præsten (V. Bierring).—Bide til bollen (Kr. N.).—**Hestesko (E. Rørdam)**, Kludetraet (Kr. N.).—Anmeldelser. Aarbog for dansk kulturhistorie (J. Ottosen).—Feilberg. Levende begravet (A.O.).—Am Tr-Ouell iii.—Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volks-kunde.—Vodskov, Dr. E. Jessens forsmædelige Skan-dale (E. Rørdam).—V. Bennike, Nordfriserne og deres land (J. O.).

ROMANIA, NO. 82, AVRIL, 1892. TOME XXI.—**Baynaud, G.**, La Chastelaine de Vergi.—**Neubauer, A.** et Meyer, P., Le Roman provençal d'Esther.—**Toynbee, P.**, Christine de Pisan and Sir John Maundeville.—**Weigand, G.**, Nouvelles recherches sur le roumain de l'Istrie.—**Mirot, L.**, Valbeton dans *Girart de Rouessillon*.—**Paris, G.**, Le chanson à boire anglo-normande parodiée du *Letabundus*.—**Paris, G.**, La traduction de la légende latine du voyage de Charlemagne à Constantinople, par Pierre de Beauvais.—**Longnon, A.**, Nouvelles recherches sur Villon.—**Thomas, A.**, Jean Castel.—**P., G.**, W. Foerster, *Romanische Bibliothek*.—**P., G.**, G. Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls des Grossen*.—**P., G.**, Karel ende Elegast, uitgegeven door E. T. Kuiper.—**M., P.**, Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres Bibliothèques, t. xxxiv, première partie.—**M., P.**, E. Forestier, *P. de Lunel, dit Cavalier Lunel de Montech*, troubadour du xiv. siècle.—**Luce, S.**, *Le Vianquier de Taillevent*, p. p. Pichon et Vicaire.

REVUE DES LANGUES ROMANES, Oct.-Nov.-Déc., 1891.—**Novati, G.**, Nouvelles recherches sur le roman de Florimont.—**Félibrié, Les Amis d'Holstenius**.—**Re-villout, La Légende de Boileau**.—**Lagarenne, P.**, Quatre fables de Lafontaine en saintongeais.—**Blanc, A.**, Le groupe et de *Sanctus*.—**Constans, L.**, A propos d'un compte rendu du *Roman de Thébes*.—**Félibrié**, Manuscrits provençaux de Marseille.—**Félibrié**, Epitaphe anacyclique de Richelieu.—**Bibliographie**, Marchot, Cours de grammaire historique, par Darmesteter.—**Félibrié**, Le Midi littéraire, par A. Roque-Ferrier.